

Reviews of Famous Books.

IX.—THE DIALOGUES OF ST. GREGORY THE GREAT.

I.

FEW, even of the most anti-Christian writers of history, have failed to acknowledge the true greatness and nobility of the character of St. Gregory. Gibbon himself seems to find it difficult to maintain, in his case, the sneering and depreciatory tone in which he has dealt with so many of the saints and pontiffs, though he speaks of the "implacable aversion of Gregory to the monuments of classic genius," declares that his writings "attest his innocence of any classic taste or literature," and tells us that a French critic has vindicated his "right to the entire nonsense of the *Dialogues*."* What this "entire nonsense" is, we hope to give our readers some opportunity of judging, in the hope that, if there are many in the present day who will probably follow Gibbon in his inane and unreasoning contempt for every narrative of supernatural occurrences, there may be many more who are not unwilling to honour a book which had much to do with the conversion of the Lombards, and has ever since been one of the most cherished treasures of Christian hagiology. But, as we have said, for St. Gregory himself it is difficult even for men of the most Gibbonian minds not to feel a certain veneration. He towers above his contemporaries, and above their immediate predecessors and followers. His monastic and ascetic character, his noble birth and secular distinction, his immense and profuse charities, his connection with the conversion of England and the Lombards, as well as of the Arians in Spain, his wonderful influence in protecting Rome and Italy at the time when the waning power of the Empire could afford so little security to dominions the titular government of which it so jealously retained—all these seem to have combined with

* Gibbon, ch. xiv.

his literary and theological eminence to produce an impression which naturally shows itself in his title of Great. Even to this day, Rome possesses more memorials connected with this Pope of the sixth century than with most of his successors. His traditional portrait still exists. His reliquary is to be seen at St. John Lateran. The basilicas in which he preached so many of his homilies retain the tradition, and in some cases the marble chair from which he spoke. His monastery on the Cælian, from which he sent forth St. Augustine and his companions to the conversion of England, still retains many precious memories of its founder, among others, the marble table at which he used daily to entertain and wait upon twelve poor men, until one day he saw a thirteenth, visible to his eyes alone, join himself to the number.* In St. Peter's and in St. Paul's *fuori le mura*, may still be seen the tablets which enumerate the estates allotted by Gregory for the maintenance of the lamps in those basilicas. The figure of the Archangel sheathing his sword, which gives their name to the bridge and Castle of S. Angelo, is a memorial of the apparition of St. Michael at that spot at the time of the great Procession ordered by St. Gregory when he was as yet only Pope-elect, for the purpose of imploring the mercy of God against the great plague which was then devastating Rome, when the three first lines of the *Regina Cæli* were heard by all the people, sung in the air by angelic voices, and Gregory intoned the fourth line, *Ora pro nobis Deum, Alleluia*, on which the plague immediately ceased. This Easter anthem, therefore, preserves his memory in the offices of the

* The inscription in the chapel where this table is preserved runs, if our memory serves us, thus—

*Hic senos dum hic Gregorius pascerebat egenos
Angelus his decimustertius accubuit.*

The story is related by Joannes Diaconus in his *Life of St. Gregory*. Gregory took the stranger by the hand when the guests dispersed, and led him apart, conjuring him to tell him his name. The angel replied that his name was a mystery, but bade him remember the day when a shipwrecked person had come to him in his cell to ask an alms, and he had given him twelve pieces of money and a silver plate on which his mother, St. Silvia, had been accustomed to send him a daily pittance of vegetables. From that moment, as the angel said, the Lord had determined to make him successor to St. Peter, who had so charitably distributed to the poor the offerings made to him by the faithful. When Gregory asked him how he knew this, the angel said who he was and disappeared. This must have been before his elevation to the Pontificate. Another time, our Lord Himself appeared to him as one of twelve poor men whose feet he was washing. The custom, according to which the Pope washes the feet of thirteen "pilgrims" on Maundy Thursday, and waits on them at table, is said to take its rise from the first of these two stories.

Church—not to speak of several hymns of his composition,* and the musical tones which bear his name. Perhaps the most touching of all these memorials which the liturgy of the Church contains are the two additions which he made to the mass—the ninefold *Kyrie eleison*, and the insertion in the canon, *diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab æterna damnatione nos eripi, et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege numerari*. We call these additions most touching, because they seem to breathe that spirit of suffering and hopelessness of all human comfort and relief which characterizes St. Gregory physically and politically. In the early days of his monastic life he was so austere as to live only upon the vegetables sent him by his mother in the plate or dish already mentioned, and, as he was incessantly occupied, frequently also in mental toil, such as prayer, reading, writing, or dictating, he brought himself to such a state that his health was ruined for the rest of his life, that he was unable to fast at all, and only obtained power to fast even on one Easter Eve by the prayers of a holy monk of Spoleto, as he tells us himself in his *Dialogues*. He was always from that time suffering in body, and the state of Italy during almost the whole of his life was most miserable, on account of the raids of the Lombards, provoked continually to war by the “exarch” of Ravenna, who was perfectly incapable of repelling their attacks.

If it is the part of a great man to stamp the impress of his own mind on successive generations of the Church, this praise also must be attributed with signal completeness to St. Gregory. We need not speak of the influence which he had in preparing the way for the establishment of the Temporal Power of the Popes, partly by his vigorous exertions to defend Rome and Italy from the Lombards, partly by the measures which he took to regain for the Church the extensive possessions in various parts of the world which Constantine and others had bestowed upon her. But almost every one of the literary works of the great Pope has retained its hold upon the Christian mind. His *Pastoral*, which our own King Alfred translated, has always been a text book for the formation of members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. We shall speak presently of the influence of his *Dialogues*. His *Morals on Job* were almost learnt by heart by such saints as St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Bernard,

* Such are the hymns *Audi benigne Conditor, Primo dierum omnium, Lucis Creator optime*, and the two sapphics *Nocte surgentes vigilemus omnes*, and *Ecce jam noctis tenuatur umbra*.

and, in later days, were the favourite reading of St. Teresa. His *Homilies on Ezechiel* and *on the Gospels* are scarcely less known. And yet, for a perfect study of the mind of this great Saint, as well as for a complete picture of the position and work of the Roman Pontiff in his time, we must turn to the fourteen books of his *Epistles*, in number as many as eight hundred and forty four. Many of these are almost formal letters of business, and there are, of course, many repetitions in the series. But it would hardly be possible to exaggerate their historical value as illustrating the points which we have just mentioned. Our present business is with the four books of the *Dialogues*, to which we shall now proceed without further preface.

II.

If the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory were to appear for the first time in our day as the work of a living author, they would be hailed by shouts either of execration or derision by the infidel press in France and Germany and the anti-Catholic press in England. If, further, the author were known to be the successor of St. Peter and of St. Gregory himself, the same writers would unanimously declare that the august prisoner of Victor Emmanuel had taken leave of his senses. Infidelity is always the same: in its hatred of the supernatural it is ever ready to trample on reason and common sense, to violate all the laws of criticism, and to shrink from no amount of misrepresentation that is necessary to discredit what it still maintains to be too absurd to need any refutation. Let a rumour spread over society that there has been an apparition of our Blessed Lady on a mountain or in a grotto in France, that a poor holy curé has had the gift of miracles, that a simple young girl has received the stigmata, or is visited on Fridays with a wonderful trance, during which her hands and feet and forehead bleed as if she were undergoing pains like to those of our Blessed Lord's Passion—and the result is at once, not that these men go to the mountain or the grotto or the cottage of the poor girl, to examine for themselves, not that they vouchsafe a moment's consideration to the accumulated evidence which may be adduced for the truth of the asserted phenomena, but that they begin at once to moralize upon the infatuated credulity of those who believe them, and of the audacious and mercenary imposture of those who are supposed to benefit by them. If we want to see something nearly bordering on "possession," we have only

to confront a modern "gentleman of the press"—one of the hierophants of the *Times* or the *Pall Mall Gazette*—with a contemporary miracle. It is a process, indeed, against which we have a special warning in the words of our Lord about casting pearls before swine. If such is the case when the miraculous fact or occurrence is something comparatively simple and ordinary, that is, falling easily within the range of those beneficent interpositions of heavenly power which are so common in the annals of the Church, we may imagine how the priests of the new heathendom of our time would foam at the mouth and go into convulsions at four whole books, full almost from beginning to end, of miracles or preternatural occurrences, many of which are certainly of the same grotesque character as the speaking of an ass or the swallowing of a prophet by a whale. Putting aside for a moment the question as to the intrinsic credibility for the narratives contained in the *Dialogues*, and the authority on which those narratives rest, we may as well begin with the occasion which produced this famous work, and the end which St. Gregory designed to serve by its publication. We shall see that this end was not, apparently, in view at the time when the compilation was begun.

Every one familiar with the life and writings of St. Gregory knows that he was first, and above all things, a monk. Even before the days of his secular greatness, when he was as yet but the promising scion of the most illustrious family at Rome, already known for the success with which he pursued the highest studies of the time, he had learnt from St. Sylvia, his mother, to pray devoutly before the picture of our Blessed Lady, and his heart was full with the love of heavenly things. The brilliancy of his talents, his high position, and, above all, his mature sense, sound judgment, and purity of life, pointed him out for the highest civil office at Rome, the prætorship, at the time when the distant and weak Court of Constantinople could or would do little more to protect the Romans against internal anarchy and external conquest at the hands of the Lombards than give them such a head as the son of the senator Gordian. Even then Gregory was a frequent visitant at Monte Cassino and Subiaco, and he had the example of the saints of his family, three aunts, Tarsilla, Gordiana, and Æmiliana, as well as of his own mother, after his father had left the world to be ordained deacon, for that retirement into the peaceful shades of the cloister on which his heart was set. When he was taken from his monastery by

the Pope and made one of the Deacons of the Church, and afterwards, during his seven years' residence at Constantinople as what we should call Nuncio of the Holy See, it was against his will that he was occupied in external business, however important, and we find him complaining in the Preface to his *Morals*—which were begun at Constantinople—of the disturbance to his peace. He tells Leander of Seville, who was at Constantinople at the same time about the affairs of Spain, that his consolation and support was in the company of some of his monks of St. Andrew's who had come with him to the Imperial Court, and with whom he was able to find time for study, reading, and pious conversation. His endeavours to escape the burthen of the Pontificate are matters of history, and the censure passed by the Bishop of Ravenna upon his flight after his election, gave occasion to his beautiful selfdefence in the famous book *Regulæ Pastoralis*. While labouring day and night during his comparatively long Pontificate, Gregory was always lamenting his enforced abandonment of the cloister, and the great disadvantage under which he laboured as to the exercises of the spiritual life. His own account of the composition of the *Dialogues* connects them with this feeling—as if he had found some consolation or some spur to exertion and hope in the memory of the many holy men whom he had known or heard of in Italy. The *Dialogues* open with a question put to him concerning his great despondency by Peter, his deacon, as he was sitting silent “in a solitary place, very fit for a sad and melancholy disposition.” After speaking of his disconsolate state in consequence of his great occupations, which hindered his soul's progress, St. Gregory goes on—

And that which doth yet grieve me more is, because I see myself so carried away amain with the boisterous blasts of this troublesome world, that I cannot now scarce behold the port from whence I did first hoist sail ; for such be the downfalls of our soul, that first it loseth that goodness and virtue, which before it possessed ; yet so that it doth still remember what it hath lost ; but afterwards, carried away more and more, and straying further from the path of virtue, it cometh at length to that pass that it doth not so much as keep in mind what before it did daily practise ; and so in conclusion, it falleth out as I said before, that sailing further on, we go at length so far, that we do not so much as once behold the sweet harbour of quiet and peace from whence we first set forth. Sometimes also my sorrow is increased by remembering the lives of certain notable men, who with their whole soul did utterly forsake and abandon this wicked world ; whose high perfection when I behold, I cannot also but see mine own infirmities and imperfection ; very many of whom did in a contemplative and retired kind of life much please God ; and lest by dealing with transitory business they might have decayed in virtue, God's goodness vouchsafed to free them from

the troubles and affairs of this wretched world. But that which I have now said would be far more plain, and the better perceived, if the residue of my speech were dialogue-wise distinguished by setting down each of our names, you asking what you shall think convenient, and I by answer giving satisfaction to such questions as you shall demand at my hands.*

The deacon Peter answers that he has not heard of many famous holy men in Italy, and thus Gregory is led to speak more fully about them and their deeds—

Such things as venerable and holy men have told me I will now without any further delay make you partaker of, and that following the example of sacred Scripture; for sure I am that St. Luke and St. Mark learned that Gospel which they wrote, not by sight, but by the relation of others; yet lest any in reading should have occasion to doubt whether such things as I write be true or no, I will set down by what means and of whom I have learned them, yet in some of them you have to know that I remember not all the particulars, but only the matter; in other some, both the matter and also the words. And besides, if I should have been so curious as to have kept in mind each man's particular words, many uttered after the country manner, would have made the style of my discourse nothing handsome nor seemly. The story which I mean first to begin with I had by the report of passing reverend men and of great years.

This rule, of carefully giving the authorities for the several miracles recorded in the *Dialogues*, is followed throughout, and we find St. Gregory writing to a bishop in Sicily, Maximianus of Syracuse, to refresh his own memory—

My brethren that live familiarly with me do enforce me by all means briefly to commit unto writing some miracles of those Fathers which we have heard done in Italy. For the effecting whereof I stand in very great need of your charitable assistance; to wit, that you should signify unto me such things as come to your memory, or it hath been your chance to know. For I remember well that you told me some things concerning Abbot Nonnosus, who lived near unto Anastasius of Pentumis, which I have quite forgotten. Wherefore I desire you to write unto me both that and whatsoever else you know of like quality, and speedily to send them, unless you determine to be here shortly yourself in person.†

This, then, is the account to be gathered from St. Gregory himself of the occasion and composition of his book. At first sight it would appear to be little more than a chance accumulation of wonderful stories. This impression, however, is soon dispelled. The second book is entirely dedicated to St. Benedict, and contains, in fact, the most authentic life which we possess of the great patriarch of Western monasticism. The third book resembles the first in being devoted to miscellaneous anecdotes of a great number of holy persons, but towards the end, St. Gregory leaves Italy, and tells the story of St. Hermenegild

* We use throughout an old English translation, published 1608.

† *Epist.* lii., 50.

and his brother King Recarede, by whose influence the Arian Goths became Catholics. This history he probably learnt from Leander of Seville, whose acquaintance he made, as we have seen, at Constantinople. He also adds the story of the African confessors whose tongues were cut out in the Vandal persecution, and who miraculously retained the power of speech. The fourth book differs from the rest in being occupied with remarkable and preternatural occurrences connected with death and the state of the soul after death, and is, in fact, a series of proofs of the immortality of the soul, and of answers to the many questions which may be raised concerning the present and future state of the dead.

The character of this last book naturally suggests the mention of the purpose for which St. Gregory employed it after its completion, if that purpose did not actually influence him at the time of its composition. We are told that St. Gregory sent the work to Queen Theodelinda, the Catholic wife of Agilulf, the King of the Lombards, who was still an Arian, and that the book aided powerfully in the conversion both of the King and of his subjects. It is not wonderful that it should have been so. The Lombards were a rude wild race, mostly heathen, with a mixture of Arians among them. A people of this kind needed to be convinced of such elementary truths as the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body, as well as of the more particularly Christian doctrines, and the best method of leading it to such a conviction, the method which has usually been chosen in the Providence of God, has been the evidence of sensible miracles. Now a very large proportion of the miracles related in the *Dialogues* of St. Gregory were not only connected with saintly persons in Italy in the generation immediately preceding the time at which he wrote, but had also been wrought in the presence or in favour of some Lombards themselves, so that it would probably be the case, either that the eyewitnesses themselves might still be appealed to, or that the tradition of these miracles existed amongst their friends, who may have heard them related by such eyewitnesses. Thus the Lombards themselves were made witnesses to the truths which the miracles attested, as well as to the sanctity of the persons by whom they were wrought. Moreover, there was a special reason why, not for the benefit of the Lombards only, a collection of well authenticated facts should be put forward in relation to the doctrine of the resurrection and the immor-

tality of the soul. The prevalent Arianism, even in countries which had before been Catholic, was, perhaps, far more of a return to heathenism than we are apt to suppose; and it is certain that the old doctrine of the Sadducees, who "say there is no resurrection, neither angel nor spirit," was received by the Arians. St. Gregory, when nuncio at the Imperial Court, had to hold a controversy with Eutychius himself, the Patriarch of Constantinople, on the kindred question of the reality of the body after resurrection, of which controversy he gives an account in his *Morals on Job*. Eutychius was so thoroughly convinced, as St. Gregory tells us, that falling ill shortly after the discussion, and being at the point of death, he showed his own hand to the bystanders, and said, "I confess that in this flesh we shall all rise again." It is, perhaps, still more surprising to find that St. Gregory states, in one of his Homilies on the Gospels, that he himself had once had difficulties and doubts about the resurrection of the body.* The appropriateness of the evidence as to these disputed truths which is collected in the *Dialogues*, especially in the fourth book, is too evident to need explanation.

III.

Having said thus much on the general character of the *Dialogues*, we may proceed to what would be the easier task of setting a few specimens before our readers, were it not that it is very difficult to make any selection within reasonable compass without feeling great regret at the necessity of omitting so much which might be quite as interesting as what we are able to quote. But we must try to cull a few of the choice flowers which St. Gregory has here collected for us. As we have mentioned the manner in which the Lombards are brought in on so many occasions, we may begin with an instance of this in the history of Sanctulus. Our quotation must be rather long, and we give it as illustrating the way in which St. Gregory keeps up a sort of commentary on what he relates, which preserves his book from being a mere collection of pious tales—

About forty days since, you saw with me one called Sanctulus, a reverend priest, who every year came to me out of Nursia; but three days ago a certain monk coming from those parts brought me very heavy news of his death. The holy life and virtue of which man was such, that although I cannot but fetch sweet sighs when I remember it, yet now I may without all fear report and publish to the world such miracles, as I have learnt by

* *Hom. in Evang.* xxvi.

the relation of very virtuous and holy priests that were his neighbours : and as amongst dear friends familiarity causeth one to presume much in charity, oftentimes myself did so courteously urge him, that he was enforced to tell me some miracles that he himself had done.—Certain Lombards being upon a time pressing of olives to make oil, Sanctulus, as he was both merry in countenance and heart, came unto them and saluted them pleasantly ; and showing them his bottle which he brought, rather willed than desired them to fill it with oil. But they, being infidels, and having laboured all day in vain, and not pressed out any oil at all, took his words in ill part, and gave him very bad speech ; but the man of God, notwithstanding this, spake unto them yet with a more merry countenance, and said, “ If you desire to do me a good turn, you will fill this bottle for Sanctulus, and so he will depart from you very well contented.” But they, seeing no oil to run forth, and hearing him, yet for all that, so earnest to have his bottle filled, fell into a great rage, and railed mightily upon him. Then the man of God, seeing that no oil came from the press, called for water, which he blessed before them all, and with his own hands, cast it upon the press, and forthwith by virtue of that benediction such plenty of oil ran forth that the Lombards, who before had long laboured in vain, did not only fill their own vessels, but also his bottle ; giving him thanks for that coming to beg oil : by his blessing he bestowed that upon them which himself had demanded.

At another time, when a great dearth was in the country, the man of God being desirous to repair the church of St. Lawrence, burnt before by the Lombards, he hired for that end many cunning workmen and divers other labourers, who of necessity were daily to be maintained ; but so great was the scarcity that he wanted bread to relieve them ; whereupon his workmen cried out for meat, because they were faint and could not labour. The man of God, hearing this, gave them comfortable words, promising to supply their want ; yet inwardly very much was he grieved, being not able to perform what he said. Going up and down, therefore, in great anxiety, he came to an oven wherein the neighbours that dwelt by had the day before baked bread : and stooping down he looked in, to see whether they had by chance left any bread behind them, where he found a loaf both greater and whiter than commonly they used, which he took away, but yet would he not by and bye give to his workmen, lest perhaps it belonged to some other body, and so might, as it were, of compassion to other have committed a sin himself. And therefore he did first show it to all the women thereabout, inquiring whether it were any of theirs, but all denied it, saying that they had all received their just number of loaves. Then the man of God, with great joy, went with that one loaf to many workmen, wishing them to give thanks to Almighty God, telling them how His goodness had provided them of necessary food ; and forthwith he set that loaf before them, whereof when they had satisfied themselves, he gathered up more pieces of bread which remained than the whole loaf itself was before in quantity. The day following, again he set it before them, and again the pieces remaining were far more than the former fragments ; and so for the space of ten days together, all those artificers and workmen lived upon that one loaf, and were very well satisfied ; something remaining every day for the next, as though the fragments had by eating increased.

Peter. A strange thing, and not unlike to that notable miracle of our Saviour, and therefore worthy to be admired of all.

Gregory. Our Saviour at this time, Peter, vouchsafed by His servant to feed many with one loaf, Who in times past by Himself fed five thousand with five loaves : and doth daily of a few grains of corn produce innumerable ears of wheat ; Who also out of the earth brought forth those very grains, and more than all this, created all things of nothing. But to the end you should not marvel any longer, what by God's assistance the venerable man Sanctulus wrought outwardly, I will now tell you what by our Lord's grace he was inwardly in his soul. Upon a certain day, the Lombards had taken a deacon, whom they kept in prison with a purpose to put him to death.

When even was come, the man of God, Sanctulus, entreated them to set him at liberty, and to grant him his life; but when he saw that he could not obtain that favour at their hands, but that they were fully resolved to have his life, then he beseeched them that they would at least commit him to his keeping, wherewith they were content, but with this condition, that if he escaped away, then himself should die for him. The man of God was very well content, and so he received the deacon into his charge and custody.

The midnight following, when he saw all the Lombards fast asleep, he called up the deacon, willing him to rise up and to run away as fast as he could. "And Almighty God," quoth he, "deliver thee out of their hands." To whom the deacon, knowing what he had promised, said, "Father, I cannot run away, for if I do, out of all doubt, they will put you to death." Yet for all this, Sanctulus enforced him to be gone with all speed, saying, "Up and away, and God of His goodness defend and protect you, for I am in His hands, and they can do no more unto me than His Divine Majesty shall give them leave." Upon these words, away went the deacon, and he that had undertaken his safekeeping, as one that had been deceived, remained behind.

In the morning, the Lombards demanded of Sanctulus for their prisoner, who told them that he was run away. "Then," quoth they, "you best know what is convenient for you to have." "Yea, marry, that do I," answered the servant of God, with great constancy. "Well," quoth they, "thou art a good man, and therefore we will not by divers torments take away thy life, but make choice of what death thou wilt." To whom the man of God answered in this manner—"Here I am, at God's disposition and pleasure, kill me in such sort as He shall vouchsafe to give you leave." Then all the Lombards who were present agreed to have him beheaded, to the end an easy and quick death might soon despatch him.

When it was given out abroad that Sanctulus was to die, whom for his virtue and holiness they greatly honoured, all the Lombards that were in those parts repaired thither, being glad, such cruel minds they have, to behold him put to death; and when all the army was gathered together, they brought him forth to execution, and the strongest man amongst them was chosen out to cut off his head at one blow.

The venerable man, beset with armed soldiers, betook himself to his usual weapons, for he desired them to give him a little leave to pray; which, when he had obtained, he cast himself prostrate upon the earth, and fell to his devotions; in which, after he had continued for a good space, the executioner spurned him up with his foot, bidding him rise, kneel down, and to prepare himself for death. The man of God rose up, bowed down his knee, and held forth his head, and beholding the drawn sword ready to despatch him, these only words they said that he spake aloud—"O St. John, hold that sword." Then the aforesaid executioner, having the naked weapon in his hand, did with all his force lift up his arm to strike off his head, but by no means could he bring it down again, for it became suddenly so stiff that it remained still above, the man not being able once to bend it downward. Then all the Lombards, who came to feed their eyes with the lamentable sight of his death, began with admiration to praise God's name, and with fear to reverence the man of God, for they now saw apparently of what great holiness he was that did so miraculously stay the arm of his executioner above in the air.

Then they desired him to rise up, which he did; but when they required him to restore his executioner's arm to his former state, he utterly refused, saying—"By no means will I once pray for him, unless beforehand he swear unto me that he will never with that arm offer to kill any Christian more." The poor Lombard, who, as we may truly say, had stretched out his arm against God, enforced with this necessity, took an oath never more to put any Christian to death. Then the man of God commanded him to put down his arm, which forthwith he did; he commanded him also to put up his

sword, which in like manner he performed. All the Lombards, by this, perceiving him to be a man of rare virtue, began in all haste to present him with the gifts of such oxen and other cattle as before they had taken from others; but the man of God utterly refused all such kind of presents, desiring them rather, if they meant to bestow anything upon him worth the giving, that they would deliver unto him all such prisoners as they had in their keeping, that he might have some cause in his prayers to commend them to Almighty God. To which request of his they condescended, and so all the poor captives were discharged: and thus by God's sweet providence, one offering himself to die for another, many were delivered from death.*

We may next give the story of Equitius, a very holy man, who, without being in orders, governed a great number of religious, and went about preaching with wonderful fruit—

Peter. Desirous I am to know what manner of life he led who is said to have received such gifts at God's hands.

Gregory. The word, Peter, proceedeth from the gift, and not the gift from the word, otherwise grace were not grace, for God's gifts do go before all works of ours, although the gifts by the works which follow do increase; but to the end that you may understand what life he led, which was known to the reverend man Albinus, Bishop of Reatino; and many there be yet alive which might very well remember the same. But what do you seek for further works whereas his purity of life was answerable to his diligence in preaching? For such a zeal to save souls had inflamed his heart, that albeit he had the charge of many monasteries, yet did he diligently travel up and down and visit churches, towns, villages, and particular men's houses, and all this to stir up the hearts of his audience to the love of heavenly joys. The apparel which he wore was so bare and contemptible, that such as knew him not would have thought scorn so much as to have saluted him, though himself had first offered that courtesy. And whithersoever he went, his manner was to ride, but that upon the most forlorn beast that could be found; his bridle was but a halter, his saddle no better than plain sheepskins. His books of divinity were put into leather bags, and those he did carry himself, some hanging upon the right side of his horse, and some upon the left; and to what place soever he came, he did so open the fountains of sacred Scripture, that he watered their souls with the heavenly dew of his sermons. Whose grace in preaching was so great, that the fame thereof came even to Rome itself; and as the tongues of flatterers do with their glorious words kill the souls of such as give them the hearing, at the same time some of the Roman clergy did in flattering sort complain unto the Bishop of this Apostolic See, saying: What manner of rustical companion is this, that hath taken upon him authority to preach, and being without learning, presumeth to usurp unto himself the office of our Apostolic Lord? Wherefore, if it please you, let him be sent for before your presence, that he may taste of the severity of ecclesiastical discipline. And as it falleth out that he which hath much business is overcome sometimes by flattery, if that pleasing venom be not speedily despatched from the soul, at the persuasion of his clergy, the Pope gave his consent that he should be sent for to Rome, to understand what talent and gift he had received from God. And so one Julianus, who afterwards was made Bishop of Sabinum, was sent, having got commandment given him to bring him up with great honour, to the end that the servant of God might not thereby sustain any detriment or injury in his fame; who, to gratify the Pope's clergy, went in post to the abbey, and finding there in his absence certain antiquaries writing, demanded of them for the abbot, who told him that he was in the

* Book iii., ch. xxxvii.

valley at the bottom of the abbey, mowing of hay. Julian had a man very proud and stubborn, and such a one that he could scarce rule him; this man he sent in all haste for the abbot, who in angry mood went his way, and coming quickly into the meadow where, beholding all who were there cutting of grass, he demanded which of them was Equitius? And when they showed him where he was, being yet far off, he fell into a great fear, and became therewith so faint, that he could scarce go upon his legs; trembling in that manner, he came unto the man of God, and humbly bowing down his head, he embraced his knees and kissed them, telling him that his master was desirous to speak with him. After God's servant had saluted him again, he willed him to take up some of the grass, and carry it home for their horse; and I will (quoth he) straightway come, when I have despatched this little work that remaineth. In this meantime, Julianus much marvelled what the matter was why his man tarried so long, and seeing him at length to come laden with grass upon his neck, in great rage he cried out to him, saying: "Sirrah, what meaneth this? I sent you to fetch me the abbot, and not to bring meat for my horse." "Sir," quoth the man, "he will come to you by and bye." And forthwith the man of God came in base apparel, and a pair of shoes beaten full of nails, carrying his scythe upon his neck, and being yet far off, his man told him that he was the abbot. So soon as Julianus beheld him, attired in that base sort, he contemned him, and devised with himself how to speak unto him in the most cross and crooked manner he could. But when God's servant drew nigh, such an intolerable fear came upon Julianus, that he fell a trembling, and his tongue so faltered that he could scarce deliver the message for which he came; whereupon he fell down at his feet, and desired he would vouchsafe to pray for him, and withal gave him to understand that his Apostolical Father the Pope was desirous to see him. Upon the receipt of which news the venerable man Equitius gave Almighty God most hearty thanks, saying that heavenly grace had visited him by means of the highest bishop, and straightway he called for some of his monks, commanding his horse to be made ready in all haste. But Julianus, weary of his journey, told him that he could not travel so soon, but of necessity must rest himself that night. "I am very sorry for that," quoth the holy man, "for if we go not today, tomorrow we shall not;" and thus by reason of the other's weariness he was enforced that night to remain in the abbey. The next morning, about the dawning of the day, came a post with a tired horse bringing letters to Julianus, commanding him not to presume to molest or to drive the servant of God out of his monastery. And when he inquired the reason of this counter command, the messenger told him that the next night after his departure, the Pope was terribly frightened in a vision for presuming to send for the man of God; whereupon Julian, rising suddenly out of his bed, and commending himself to the venerable man's prayers, spake thus unto him—"Our Father desireth you not to trouble yourself any further, but to stay in your monastery." Which when the servant of God heard, very sorry he was, and said—"Did I not tell you that if we did not set forward on our journey by and bye that afterwards we should not?" Then upon charity he entertained his messenger a little while with him in his cloister, and though by all means he refused, yet he enforced upon him a reward for the pains he had taken. See, therefore, Peter, how God doth preserve and keep them who in this life do condemn themselves, and how they are secretly honoured of the citizens in heaven who are not ashamed outwardly to be little esteemed in this world; and, on the contrary, in the sight of God, they be of no account who in the eyes of their own friends and neighbours do swell through desire of vainglory. And therefore our Saviour Christ, Who was truth itself, said to certain—"You are they that justify yourselves before men, but God knoweth your hearts, for that which is high to men is abominable in the sight of God."*

* Book i., ch. iv.

Another characteristic story, with its moral attached to it, is to be found in the following account of a certain Isaac, who came from the East to Italy—

Gregory. At such time as the Goths first invaded Italy, there was near to the city Spoleto a virtuous and holy man named Isaac, who lived almost to the last days of the Goths, whom many did know, and especially the holy virgin Gregoria, which now dwelleth in this city, hard by the Church of the Blessed and Perpetual Virgin Mary, which woman in her younger years, desiring to live a nun's life, fled to the church from marriage, already agreed upon by her friends, and was by this man defended; and so, by God's providence, obtained to have that habit which so much she desired, and so, leaving her spouse upon earth, she merited a Spouse in heaven. Many things I had also by the relation of the reverend man, Eleutherius, who was familiarly acquainted with him, and his virtuous life doth give credit to his words. This holy man, Isaac, was not born in Italy, and therefore I will only speak of such miracles as he did living here in our country. At his first coming out of Syria to the city of Spoleto, he went to the church, and desired the keepers that he might have free leave to pray there, and not be enforced to depart when night came. And so he began his devotions, and spent all that day in prayer, and likewise the night following. The second day and night in the same manner, and remained there also the third day, which when one of the keepers of the church perceived, who was a man of a proud spirit, he took scandal by that whereof he ought to have reaped great profit; for he began to say he was an hypocrite and cozening companion, who, in the sight of the world, remained at his prayers three days and three nights together; and forthwith running upon the man of God, he struck him, to make him by that means with shame to depart the church as an hypocrite and one that desired to be reputed a holy man. But to revenge this injury, a wicked spirit did presently possess his body, who cast him down at the feet of the man of God, and began by his mouth to cry out, "Isaac doth cast me forth; Isaac doth cast me forth." For what name the strange man had, none at that time did know, but the wicked spirit told it when he cried out that he had power to cast him out. Straightways, the man of God laid himself upon his body, and the cursed devil that was entered in departed in all haste. News of this was by and bye blown over the whole city, and men and women, rich and poor, came running, every one striving to bring him home to their own house; some, for the building of an abbey, did humbly offer him lands, others money, and some such other helps as they could. But the servant of Almighty God, refusing to accept any of their offers, departed out of the city, and not far off he found a desert place where he built a little cottage for himself; to whom many repairing, began by his example to be inflamed with the love of everlasting life, and so, under his discipline and government, gave themselves to the service of Almighty God. And when his disciples would often humbly insinuate that it were good for the necessity of the abbey to take such things as were offered, he, very careful to keep poverty, told them constantly, saying, "A monk that seeketh things upon earth is no monk;" for so fearful he was to lose the secure state of his poverty, as covetous rich men are careful to preserve their corruptible wealth.

In that place, therefore, he became famous for the spirit of prophecy, and his life was renowned far and near for the notable miracles which he wrought. For upon a day, towards evening, he caused his monks to lay a certain number of spades in the garden. The night following, when, according to custom, they rose up to their prayers, he commanded them, saying, "Go your ways and make pottage for our workmen, that it may be ready very early in the morning." And when it was day, he bade them bring the pottage which they had provided, and going with his monks into the garden, he found there so many men working as he had commanded them to lay spades; for it fell

so out, that certain thieves were entered in to spoil and rob it, but God changing their minds, they took the spades which they found there, and so wrought from the time of their first entrance until the man of God came unto them, and all such parts of the ground as before were not manured, they had dug up and made ready. When the man of God was come, he saluted them in this wise : " God save you, good brethren ; you have laboured long, wherefore now rest yourselves." Then he caused such provision as he had brought to be set before them, and so, after their labour and pains, refreshed them. When they had eaten that was sufficient, he spake thus unto them : " Do not hereafter any more harm, but when you desire anything in the garden, come to the gate, quietly ask it, and take it a' God's blessing, but steal no more." And so, bestowing upon them good store of words, he sent them away. And by this means it fell out, that they which came into the garden to do harm, departed thence not doing any damage at all, and besides, had the reward of their pains and somewhat also of charity bestowed on them.

At another time there came unto him certain strange men a begging, so torn and tattered that they had scarce any rags to cover them, humbly beseeching him to help them with some clothes. The man of God, hearing their demand, gave them no answer, but, secretly calling for one of his monks, bade him go into such a wood, and in such a place of the wood to seek for a hollow tree, and to bring unto him that apparel which he found there. The monk went his way, and brought closely to his master that which he had found. Then the man of God called for those poor naked men, and gave them that apparel, saying—" Put on these clothes to cover your naked bodies withal." They, seeing their own garments, were wonderfully confounded, for thinking by cunning to have gotten other men's apparel, with shame they perceived only their own.

Again, at another time, one there was that commended himself to his prayers, and sent him by his servant two baskets full of meat, one of the which, as he was in his journey, he took away and hid in a bush until his return back again, and the other he presented to the man of God, telling him how his master had sent him that, heartily commending himself to his prayers. The holy man took that which was sent very kindly, giving the messenger this good lesson—" I pray thee, my friend, to thank thy master, and take heed how thou dost lay hand upon the basket, for a snake is crept in, and therefore be careful lest otherwise it doth sting thee." At these words the messenger was pitifully confounded, and though glad he was that by this means he had escaped death, yet somewhat grieved that he was put to that shame. Coming back to the basket, very diligent and careful he was in touching it, for, as the man of God had told him, a snake in very deed was got in. This holy man, therefore, albeit he were incomparably adorned with the virtue of abstinence, contempt of worldly wealth, the spirit of prophecy, and perseverance in prayer, yet one thing there was in him which seemed reprehensible, to wit, that some time he would so exceed in mirth that, if men had not known him to have been so full of virtue, none would ever have thought it.

Peter. What, I beseech you, shall we say to that ? For did he willingly give himself sometime to such recreation, or else, excelling in virtue, was he, contrary to his own mind, drawn some time to present mirth ?

Gregory. God's providence, Peter, in bestowing of His gifts is wonderful. For often it falleth out that upon whom He vouchsafeth the greater He giveth not the less, to the end that always they may have somewhat to mislike in themselves, so that, desiring to arrive unto perfection, and yet cannot, and labouring about that which they have not obtained, and cannot prevail. By this means they become not proud of those gifts which they have received, but do thereby learn that they have not those greater gifts of themselves who of themselves cannot overcome small faults.*

* Book iii., ch. xiv.

We must also find room for the account of Eleutherius, at whose prayer it was that Gregory himself was enabled to fast on Easter Eve—

Eleutherius, of whom I made mention before, Father of the Abbey of the Evangelist St. Mark, which is in the suburbs of the city of Spoleto, lived long time together with me in this city in my monastery, and there ended his days. Of whom his monks do report that by his tears he raised up one that was dead; for he was a man of such simplicity and compunction, that no doubt but those tears coming from his humble and simple soul were of force to obtain many things of Almighty God. One miracle of his I will now tell you, which himself, being demanded of me, did with great simplicity confess. As he was travelling on a certain day, and not finding at night any other place to lodge in, he went to a nunnery, where there was a little boy, which the wicked spirit did usually every night torment. The nuns giving entertainment to the man of God, desired him that the said little boy might remain with him all night, wherewith he was well content. In the morning, the nuns diligently inquired of the Father, if the child had not been once troubled and tormented that night; who, marvelling why they asked that question, answered that he perceived not any such thing. Then they told how a wicked spirit did every night pitifully afflict the child, and earnestly desired him that he would take him home to his own abbey, because their hearts could not endure to behold any such misery. The old man yielded to their request, and so carried away the boy home to his own monastery, where he remained long time safe and sound, the devil not presuming to touch him. Whereupon the old man, seeing him to continue so well, was immoderately glad thereof, and therefore in the presence of the monks he spake thus—"The devil did dally with those Sisters; now he hath to do with the servants of God, he dare not come near this boy." He had scarce uttered these words, when as in that very instant the poor child was in the presence of them all possessed, and pitifully tormented; which the old man beholding, straightways lamented and fell a weeping, and persevering so a long time, the monks came to comfort him, but he answered them, saying—"Believe me," quoth he, "none of you shall this day eat any bread unless the boy be dispossessed." Then, with the rest of the brethren, he fell prostrate to his prayers, and there they continued so long until the boy was delivered from his former torments, and besides so perfectly cured that the wicked spirit never after presumed to molest him any more.

Peter. I verily suppose that he sinned a little in vainglory, and that God's pleasure was that the other monks should cooperate to the dispossessing of the devil.

Gregory. It is even so as you say, for seeing he could not alone bear the burden of that miracle, it was divided amongst the rest of his brethren. Of what force and efficiency this man's prayers were I have found by experience in myself; for being upon a time when I lived in the abbey so sick, that I often swooned, and was by means thereof with often pangs continually at death's door, and in such case that unless I did continually eat something, my vital spirit was going away. Easter Day was at hand, and therefore, when I saw that upon so sacred a vigil I could not refrain from often eating, in which not only old persons, but even children used to fast, I was more afflicted with grief than with mine infirmity; yet at length my sorrowful soul quickly found out a device, and that was, to carry the man of God secretly into the oratory, and there to entreat him that he would by his prayers obtain for me of God so much strength and ability as to fast that day, which fell out accordingly; for so soon as we came into the oratory, with humility and tears he fell to his prayers, and after awhile (having made an end) he came forth, and upon the words of his blessed prayers my stomach grew so strong, that I did not so much as think of any meat, nor feel any grief at all. Then

I began to marvel at myself, and to think in what case I was before, and how I felt myself now; and when I thought upon my former sickness, I found none of those pangs with which before I was troubled; and when my mind was busy about the affairs of the abbey, my sickness was quite out of my memory, yea, and as I said; if I did think thereof, yet feeling myself so well and strong, I began to doubt whether I had eaten or no. When evening was come, I found myself so lusty, that I could very well have fasted until the next day. And by this means having experience of his prayers in myself, I made no doubt also but those things also were true which in other places he did, though myself was not then present.*

IV.

The fourth book of the *Dialogues*, as we have already hinted, deserves separate consideration, on account of the subject matter to which it is devoted. It is not, perhaps, so interesting in all respects as the second, which is, in truth, a life of St. Benedict, and has thus the additional attraction of a sustained subject of the highest importance. On the other hand, this fourth book deals with a series of questions which are always more or less before the minds of most men—questions which relate to the great practical problems of death, immortality, and the state of the soul in a future existence. On this account this book has probably been better known than any of the other three. We can easily see how useful its chapters must have been in the work of converting the Lombards. The design of the writer is more continually evident than in the former books, and Peter the deacon is made to ask his questions, one after another, as if to exhaust all the topics connected with the general subject already indicated. St. Gregory begins by bewailing the blindness as to spiritual truths which is one of the consequences of the Fall—

For it is in this case as if a woman big with child should be put in prison, and be there delivered of a son which never went forth, but was there continually brought up. For if his mother should tell him of the sun, moon, stars, mountains, and speak of the fields, the flying of birds, and the running of horses, her child that had been continually brought up in the prison, and acquainted with nothing else but black darkness, might well hear what she said, but with a doubt whether it were true or no, because experience taught him not any such thing. Even so men that are born in this dark world, the place of their banishment, do hear that there be wonderful, strange, and invisible things; but because they are not acquainted with any else than terrestrial creatures, which only be visible, they doubt whether there be any such invisible things as are reported of or no. For which cause the Creator Himself of all things, both visible and invisible, and the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father, came into this world for the redemption of mankind, and sent the Holy Ghost unto our hearts, that quickened by Him and His grace, we should believe those things which as yet by sense or experience we

* Book iii., ch. xxxiii.

cannot possibly understand ; and therefore so many of us as have received His spirit, the heavenly pledge of our inheritance, make no doubt of God's invisible and immortal creatures ; and whosoever as yet is not settled in this belief out of all question, he ought of reason to give credit to the words of them that be more learned and holy, and believe them that through the grace of God's Holy Spirit have experience of those things that be invisible. For he were a very foolish child that thought his mother lied when she spake of light in other places, because himself, where he was, beheld nothing else but the darkness of the prison.*

He then speaks of the three kinds of spirits with life which God hath created—spirits without bodies, the angels ; spirits with bodies, but which do not die with the latter, men ; and spirits that have bodies and die with them, the animals.† Then he answers an objection from Ecclesiastes iii., where Solomon says, "There is one death of men and beasts, and their state is both alike," by saying that the Preacher here speaks in the person of the ignorant. He next proves the reality of the existence of the soul, even after leaving the body, by an argument which seems drawn from our Blessed Lord's answer to the Sadducees, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living—

Seeing, therefore, you doubt not but that God is the Creator and Preserver of all things, that He doth fill and embrace all things, that He doth excel all things and also maintaineth them, that He is incircumscribable and invisible, so neither ought you to doubt but that He is served with invisible creatures, seeing they that serve ought to be somewhat like unto Him upon Whom they attend, and so, consequently, that we ought not to doubt, but forasmuch as He is invisible in Himself, that they also be of the same nature. And what creatures can these be else but His holy angels, and the souls of just men ? Therefore, as you know when you see the body move that the soul remaineth in the body, and you gather this from the body which is lowest, so ought you to think of the life of the soul that departeth from the body, deducing a reason from God, Who is the Highest, to wit, that the soul liveth invisibly, seeing it is to remain in the service of the invisible Creator.

In the next chapter,‡ St. Gregory teaches that as "the life of the soul remaining in the body is gathered by the motion of the members, so the life of the soul after death in holy men is to be found out by the virtue of miracles." Then follow a series of chapters relating marvellous incidents connected with the death of certain holy people. St. Benedict saw the soul of Germanus, Bishop of Capua, carried to heaven in a fiery globe ; the soul of a monk named Speciosus was seen to depart by his brother when at a distance, a dove was seen coming out of the mouth of the Abbot Spes at the moment of his death, a holy

* Book iv., ch. .

† Ch. iii.

‡ Ch. vi.

priest, Ursinus, saw St. Peter and St. Paul come to him when he was dying, and St. Peter also appeared to a holy nun, Galla, at the same time—

At length, when Almighty God determined to bestow upon her an everlasting reward, He sent her a cancer in one of her breasts. Two candles she had usually in the night-time burning before her bed, for loving light, she did not only hate spiritual darkness, but also corporal. One night, lying sore afflicted with this her infirmity, she saw St. Peter standing before her bed, betwixt the two candlesticks, and being nothing afraid, but glad, love giving her courage, she spake unto him, "How is it, my lord? What! are my sins forgiven me?" To whom (as he hath a most gracious countenance) he bowed down a little his head, and said, "Thy sins are forgiven thee. Come and follow me!" But because there was another nun in the monastery which Galla loved more than the rest, she straightway beseeched him that Sister Benedicta might go with her. To whom he answered that she could not then come, but another should; and "as for her," quoth he, "whom you now request, thirty days hence shall she follow you." And when he had thus said, he vanished out of her sight. After whose departure she straightway called for the Mother of the convent, and told her what she had seen and heard. And the third day following both she and the other before mentioned departed this life, and she also whose company Galla desired the thirtieth day after did follow them.*

We must find room for another instance from this part of the book, the departure of Servulus—

Here also we have to know that oftentimes at the death of God's servants^s heavenly music is heard, to the end that while they give willing ear to that melody, the soul may have no leisure to feel when it departeth from the body. For I remember that in my Homilies upon the Gospels I told how, in that porch which is in the way to St. Clement's Church, there lay a certain man called Servulus, whom I doubt not but you also do remember, who, as he was poor in wealth, so rich in merits. This man had long time been afflicted with sickness; for, from the first time that I knew him to the very last hour of his life, never can I remember but that he was sick of the palsy, and that so pitifully, that he could not stand, nor sit up in his bed, neither was he ever able to put his hand to his mouth, or to turn from one side to the other. His mother and brethren did serve and attend him, and what he got in alms that, by their hands, he bestowed on other poor people. Read, he could not; yet did he buy the Holy Scriptures, which very carefully he caused such religious men as he entertained to read unto him; by means whereof, according to his capacity, though, as I said, he knew not a letter of the book, yet did he fully learn the Holy Scripture. Very careful he was in his sickness always to give God thanks, and day and night to praise His holy name.

When the time was come in which God determined to reward this his great patience, the pain of his body struck inwardly to his heart, which he feeling, and knowing that his last hour was not far off, called for all such strangers as lodged in his house, desiring them to sing hymns with him, for his last farewell and departure out of this life; and as he was himself singing with them, all on a sudden he cried out aloud, and bade them be silent, saying—"Do ye not hear the great and wonderful music which is in heaven?" And so whiles he lay giving of ear within himself to that divine harmony, his holy soul departed this mortal life; at which time all that were there present felt a most pleasant and fragrant smell, whereby they perceived how

* Ch. xiii.

true it was that Servulus said. A monk of mine, who yet liveth, was then present, and with many tears useth to tell us that the sweetness of that smell never went away, but that they felt it continually until the time of his burial.*

A good many chapters follow in the same strain, some of the stories being extremely beautiful in themselves, as, for instance, that of the little girl Musa, to whom our Blessed Lady appeared, accompanied by a number of young maidens dressed in white, and asked her whether she would like to join their company. Musa said she would gladly do so, and then our Lady told her she must correct her girlish levity and love of amusement, and might then hope to be called away within thirty days. The child altered her ways, and died before the appointed time was over.† Some of these anecdotes refer to monks and others who had been put to death by the Lombards, and afterwards became famous for miracles, whereon Peter asks how it is that God let such dear friends of His be put to death. St. Gregory answers by instancing the Scriptural case of the man of God who was sent to Bethel, who was slain by the lion for his disobedience in one action, though the history showed that his body was preserved as the body of a saint. Peter goes on to ask as to a number of points of the same kind. "Do the souls of the just go to heaven before the resurrection?" St. Gregory answers that they do, and proves it from our Lord's saying, that "where the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together," and from St. Paul's expressions about being dissolved and being with Christ.

Another question touches on the occasional prophecies which are made by the dying.‡ "Sometimes the soul itself by reason of the spiritual nature which it hath, doth foresee something which will so fall out: and, sometimes, souls before their departure come to the knowledge of future things by revelation: sometimes also when they are straightways to leave the body, by heavenly inspiration they penetrate with their spiritual eyes the secrets of heaven." Anecdotes are given to illustrate each branch of the answer. One of them is of

A young monk called Mellitus, a man of wonderful simplicity and humility, whose last days being come, he fell desperately sick of the common disease [the plague then raging], which, when venerable Felix, bishop of the same place, understood (by whose relation myself have learned this story), very careful he was to visit him, and with sweet words to comfort him against death, adding, notwithstanding, that by God's grace he might live long in this world. To whom the sick man answered that his time was at

* Ch. xiv.

† Ch. xvii.

‡ Ch. xxvi.

hand, saying, that there came unto him a young man with letters wanting him to open and read them ; which when he had done, he said that he found both his own name and all the rest of them which the Easter before had been baptized by that bishop, written in letters of gold. And first of all he said that he found his own name, and afterwards the rest of those that were christened at that time, by which he made no doubt that both himself and the rest should shortly depart this life. And so it fell out, for he died that very day, and after him followed all those which had before been baptized, so that within the space of a few days no one of them was left alive.*

After this there are a number of chapters about hell, its fire, how it can burn souls, and some stories of Theodoric and others, to whose condemnation certain marvellous sights bear witness. Then the question is handled, whether the good know the good, and the wicked the wicked ; which is answered by a reference to our Saviour's account of Lazarus and the rich glutton. Then follow anecdotes of souls which have come back to life after seeing the next world. One of these stories, related on the authority of a monk in Spain, is long and full of details. A little later on Peter asks a question about Purgatory. St. Gregory says that it must be allowed to exist for the punishment

Of certain small sins, because our Saviour saith that he which speaketh blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, that it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come. Out of which sentence we learn that some sins are forgiven in this world, and some other may be pardoned in the next, for that which is denied concerning one sin is consequently understood to be granted touching some other. But yet this, as I said, we have not to believe, but only concerning little and very small sins, as for example, daily idle talk, immoderate laughter, negligence in the care of our family (which kind of offences scarce can they avoid that know in what sort sin is to be shunned), ignorant errors in matters of no great weight : all which sins will be punished after death, if men procure not pardon and remission for them in their lifetime:†

He tells a story of Paschasius, who took the wrong side in a question as to the election of Pope when Symmachus was the lawful successor of St. Peter, and who, though a man of eminent sanctity, had to suffer after his death for his fault in this respect.

We come next to a curious question, which with its answer we shall give in full—

Peter. What, I pray you, is the reason that in these latter days so many things come to light which in times past were not known, in such sort that by open revelations and manifest signs, the end of the world seemeth not to be far off?

Gregory. So it is, for the reason that this present world draweth towards an end, so much the more the world to come is at hand, and showeth itself by more plain and evident tokens. For, seeing in this world we know not

* Ch. xxvi.

† Ch. xxxix.

one another's cogitations, and in the next men's hearts will be known to all, what fitter name can we give to this world than to term it night, and what better to the next than to call it day? But as when the night is almost spent, and the day beginneth to break, darkness and light are in a certain manner joined together, until the light of the day following doth perfectly banish away the dark remnants of the former night, even so the end of this world is, as it were, mingled together with the beginning of the next; and with the darkness of this some light of such spiritual things as be in that doth appear. And so we see many things which belong to that world, yet for all this, perfect knowledge we have not any, but as it were in the twilight of our soul behold them before the rising of that sun of knowledge which then abundantly will cast his beams over all.*

The concluding chapters of this last book, which treat of hell, its fire, dreams, the fear of death, and other subjects, we must pass over very lightly. They are among the most interesting of all, and some of them have probably had more influence on Christian practice in the centuries subsequent to St. Gregory than any other. We speak particularly of those in which he dwells on the efficacy of the holy sacrifice of the mass for the help of souls which have to suffer in the next world, as well as for the relief of suffering in this. It is here that he relates how a prisoner had found his bonds loosened on certain days, when his wife had procured that the sacrifice of the mass should be offered for him, as well as how he had himself enjoined that mass should be said for thirty consecutive days for the soul of a monk of his own monastery, of whom before his death it had been discovered that he had kept some money in his cell, and on whom in consequence Gregory had passed the terrible sentence that his brethren should not visit him to comfort him on his deathbed, and that his body should be refused burial in the common cemetery. He ends the whole subject by chapters on the necessity of contrition of heart and of the forgiveness of all injuries.

v.

Such, then, is a brief and very incomplete account of this famous book of one of the most famous of the Popes, as to which modern thinkers will probably be uncertain whether to marvel most that St. Gregory should have written it, or that it should have had so much influence in the conversion of the Lombards and over the minds of Christians of subsequent generations. And yet we think it is but the shallowest criticism that can depreciate such a volume. The narratives are artless and unpolished in style, but there is real beauty in their simplicity as well as in the incidents of which they are composed, and

* Ch. xli.

of which, of course, St. Gregory is merely the historian. He has a definite and a high purpose throughout, and no peculiarities of circumstances, time, or country, can detract from the universal interest of the subject and questions which underlie the whole series of his chapters. Thus, though there is not that rich beauty of colouring, that sunny warmth, that exquisite native grace about the *Dialogues* which we find in a work like the *Fioretti of St. Francis*, there is still something of a kindred charm and fragrance about both volumes. The difference between the two is the difference of age and circumstance: the difference between the bright joyous, because the thoroughly Christianized, Italy of the middle ages, and the same country writhing under the hoof of barbarian invaders in the period of decay and decomposition which few ever expected to give birth to the glorious, though slow, revival of which the Church was to be the nursing mother. And, again, a part of the beauty of the *Fioretti* consists in the absence of any didactic end in their writers, while, as we have said, St. Gregory's *Dialogues* were put together for a special purpose. Still, when they are measured by the standard of their own time, and when we consider the fruit which they produced, it is puerile to ignore their value or deny their merit. Christian minds, and not Christian minds only, will always be strongly attracted by narratives of the miraculous evidences of high sanctity, and the questions connected with death, our future state, and the world beyond the grave into which those who have gone before us have passed, will never lose their hold upon our interest. If nothing true and authentic, nothing holy and sublime, be set forth concerning these questions, men will feed themselves upon garbage for want of wholesome food. The people who will sneer with Gibbon at the "nonsense of the *Dialogues*," will perhaps be found presently afterwards seated round a table in a darkened room listening for knocks or letting invisible agents guide their hands in the production of spirit writings, and after having cast aside the Christian belief as to the retributions of the next world, to which their own conscience bears so strong a witness, they may be the dupes of the lying Universalism which is the creed taught by most Spiritualist manifestations, if not of the shameful and profligate immorality to which that creed ultimately leads.

The extracts which we have given from the *Dialogues* may suffice as indications of the kind of Christianity which was evidently the religion of their author. It is hardly necessary

to warn the Protestant reader that he will find the Popery which, as he has been taught to believe, was an overgrowth of mediæval times, fullblown and rampant in St. Gregory the Great. If any one really thinks that the Christianity which the great Pontiff sent St. Augustine to teach to our Saxon ancestors was that decorous, moderate, and somewhat cold religionism which is now taught in the Anglican Establishment, we fear that, unless he is prepared to undergo a severe disappointment, he had better not read the writings of the Apostle of England. We can but wonder what learned men like Dr. Wordsworth or Dr. Harold Browne, who maintain that the "Church of England" of our day is identical with the Anglo-Saxon Church in doctrine and discipline, must think of St. Gregory the Great, with whose works no one who professes to have a claim to learning can be unacquainted. Unless there was some intermediate "reformation" in the English Church before the days of Henry the Eighth, as to which history is altogether silent, it is quite certain that the religion introduced by St. Augustine and handed on through so many generations until the time when

Gospel truth first beam'd from Boleyn's eyes,

can never have been less "Popish" than the religion to which every page of these *Dialogues* witnesses—a religion of monks and nuns and anchores, of monastic poverty, of vows of chastity which it was sacrilege to break even for marriage, of clerical celibacy, of the invocation of saints, of pilgrimages and shrines and relics and miracles, of the sign of the cross and holy water, of Purgatory, of "sacrifices of masses" for the living and the dead, of trentals, of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, of the primacy of the Roman See, and of the superiority of the successor of St. Peter over all other bishops. The testimony of the book before us on these points, is all the more conclusive because it is so entirely incidental and undesigned, and because it results simply from the picture which a series of such anecdotes necessarily represents of the whole scenery and atmosphere in which the actors lived and moved.

It is characteristic of the real greatness of St. Gregory that he was so unconscious of the great work for the future of the Church and of Christian Europe of which he was laying the foundations, amidst so much pain, sorrow, and anxiety to himself. To him the social aspect of the world in which he

lived was all but hopeless; he saw nothing before him but decay, an ever increasing corruption and decomposition of society, feebleness in the only secular power which represented Christianity, strength, force, aggressiveness in the powers which had hitherto done nothing but destroy. And yet he was preparing the first elements of Christian Europe by his efforts for the conversion of the strong vigorous nations which had possessed themselves of the West, and were bearing down so threateningly on Rome herself. From motives of simple charity and benevolence, for the protection of the weak, and in order to have resources which might supply the inexhaustible demands of his bounty and munificence, he reclaimed and brought under the control of the Holy See the abundant possessions with which the earlier Christian Emperors had endowed it, and he thus paved the way, as well as by his active interference with the Lombards in the cause of peace, for the greatest blessing which Italy ever had, the Temporal Power of the Roman Pontiff. Even the great doctrine, afterwards so nobly vindicated by Gregory the Seventh, of the independence and the supremacy of the spiritual power, is distinctly formulated and asserted by St. Gregory himself, though he lived in a time when the Emperor's approval had to be sought for the election of a Pope, and though his own official letters to the successive despots at Constantinople have brought upon him the reproach of servility from writers who do not understand that his language is merely that of the recognized courtesy of the time. In this and in other respects St. Gregory, whose writings are all dashed with an air of sadness and hopelessness as to the future of the world, and who certainly expected—as St. Leo expected in his day, and so many other saints in theirs—the immediate conclusion of the drama of human history, as if society no longer contained any elements of life and regeneration, was in truth preeminently a labourer for the future. Monk and Pope as he was, he was providing for the creation of a new world out of the dissolving chaos all around him, mainly by the labours, in the first instance, of monks, as well as by the continued action of the ever young, ever vigorous, and ever beneficent wisdom of his successors in the Pontificate. *Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem!* The Church had indeed to “outwatch the stars” in order to frame Christendom—almost against the will of the Christian nations themselves. The thought of the greatness of the work may well fill us with indignation at the miserable folly, the

childish perversity, which have set to work to destroy it. But it may also suggest other and more hopeful reflections. It may give us confidence that the ignorance, the conceit, the frivolity, the petty feebleness of our time may not, after all, avail to pull to pieces so noble an edifice. And, if our own days look dark, and if we can see but few elements of hope and strength left in European society, it may comfort us to remember that Providence is always far more merciful to human waywardness than it deserves, that the resources of divine goodness are not inexhaustible because we seem to ourselves to have exhausted them, that the Church never grows old or weak, and can always heal and renovate the social system which she created. When the Pontiff to whom England owes so much looked from his monastery on the Cælian over the Campagna, then first made an unwholesome desert by the ravages of the Lombards, his heart might well mourn over the moral desolation which seemed about to fall upon the world, while yet so many glorious centuries were in the womb of time—centuries for which he was himself to labour so fruitfully. The Piedmontese are despicable indeed by the side of the Lombards: Agilulf is a nobler figure than Victor Emmanuel. But the Church has struck her roots far deeper into society in the nineteenth than in the sixth century, and her sufferings in the days of Pius the Ninth may be the birthpangs of a still more marvellous future than that which was hidden from the eagle gaze of the great St. Gregory.

H. J. C.

Golden Sails.

SET TO MUSIC BY HENRY SMART.

I WATCHED the seawinds wake and fill
The sails that bare my love from me ;
I climbed the lofty lighthouse hill
To catch them gleaming down the sea.
I looked towards my lonely home,
I heard the shipmen gaily sing,
As swift they swept across the foam,
Against the gold red sunset ring.
And ever when my lone heart fails,
To this sweet comfort shall I hold ;
—I saw my true love's passing sails,
But they were lit with gleams of gold.

In hope I wait ; the years go by ;
I gaze across the cruel tide,
The kind-heart gossips draw them nigh,
To weep in pity at my side.
They tell me of wild stormy skies,
Of one that comes no more to me,
They whisper how he drownèd lies,
Ah, dead ! my love, far out at sea.
But, when my broken spirit fails,
A glimpse of other worlds is given :
The jasper sea, glad Home-set sails,
All golden with the lights of Heaven.
F. E. W.

Erasmus.

To write the biography of one who has been the leading mind of his age, is to write the history of that age; and a life of Erasmus, besides an analysis of his voluminous writings, would call for a disquisition on the revival of classical studies in Europe and that religious revolution which was indirectly connected with it, and which goes by the name of the "Reformation." But a sketch may give a true, if incomplete, portrait of the features it portrays, and while it satisfies the interest of ordinary beholders may serve to guide the painter, who chooses to attempt it, in an elaborate delineation of its subject.

Erasmus was born at Rotterdam, and most probably (for the commencement of his life is shrouded in a certain amount of obscurity) on the night of the 27th or 28th of October, 1466. He was the second child of a criminal intercourse between the daughter of a physician of Zevenberg and a young man of Ter-gouw, named Peter Gerard, the youngest but one of a family of ten sons, and destined by his relations for the priesthood, who, finding his character blasted by the discovery of his crime, and himself the object of the indignation and execration of his family and neighbours, fled his country, leaving this brief communication as an indication to his friends of a resolution which he did not fulfil—"Farewell. You shall never see me again."

With the view of preventing scandal and the disgrace of his mother, the infant Erasmus was reared in the household of his paternal grandfather. His father, who was a man of education, went to Rome, where he maintained himself by transcribing books. He afterwards became a skilful printer, applied himself to study, and attained to considerable learning. His family, on ascertaining that he was living in Rome, wrote to him and, in the hope of inducing him to return to Holland, assured him that the young woman whom he had wished to marry was dead. Believing this, he became a priest, and did not discover the fraud till he returned to his native country several years later.

Gerard from the first had determined to give Erasmus a liberal education, and this was undertaken by his uncle, Peter Winkel, who taught a school in the little town of Ter-Gouw. The commencement of Erasmus' studies was most unpromising, and in after life he used to console the parents of children who did not respond to the hopes entertained of them, by pointing to the little progress made in his own outset in the academical career. This want of progress, he tells us, was owing to "the repulsive nature of studies *for which he was not born*"—intending by this expression the rude unpolished systems of education which flourished during the middle ages. For a short time he served as a chorister in the Cathedral of Utrecht, and when nine years of age he was sent by his father, who always watched over his education, to Deventer, then the most flourishing school in the Netherlands, where, under Alexander Hegius, the influence of Italy was already making itself felt in producing a higher standard of classical literature and the study of Greek.

Here the genius of Erasmus immediately displayed itself, and, surpassing all his competitors, he became *facile princeps* among the scholars of Deventer. His memory appears to have been prodigious. When eleven years of age he knew the whole of Horace and Terence by heart, the latter being his favourite author, whom in his maturer years he always recommended as the best model for the formation of style, and also of manners if read with becoming dispositions in the student. At twelve years of age he received the praises of some of the first scholars of the day and their auguries of his future greatness, and the following year (at which time both his parents died of the plague, and he was in consequence removed from Deventer), he tells us himself that he was master of the Latin language, had made some progress in Greek, and had completed his course of logic, physics, metaphysic, and moral philosophy.

His character showed remarkable activity and independence, and a maturity beyond his years. After the death of his parents he returned to Ter-gouw, where he lived under the tutelage of three guardians, his uncle, the schoolmaster at Ter-gouw, acting for the two others. We have only his own account, and that an imperfect one, of what passed in connection with his entrance into religious life. Highly gifted by nature, and most prepossessing, giving promise of the greatest ability, it was suggested to him by more than one superior of the religious houses that he visited, that he should consecrate himself to God by the vows of

religion. His guardians, and notably Peter Winkel, his uncle, of whom Erasmus writes as though he had been the evil genius of his life, proposed that he should enter, as a novice, the monastery of Sion, near Delft, the principal house of the Canons Regular in the Netherlands. Much persuasion was used, which he met by evasions, till the matter was pressed to a point which demanded a decisive answer. He then replied that he was too young to comprehend the obligations of a religious life, and that he deferred his answer till maturer age might enable him to arrive at a sound decision. Winkel threatened him, not only with his displeasure, but with beggary and misery, and his own resignation of his guardianship, in the event of his refusing his consent. Erasmus stood firm in his resolve, and accepted the threatened resignation. He proposed spending three or four years in the Universities of Europe before entering upon the serious consideration of his vocation. It is only to be regretted that he did not persevere in the resolution he had taken.

Shortly afterwards he visited the monastery of the Canons Regular at Stein, near Ter-Gouw, where a former fellow-student and friend, to whom he was much attached, had entered as a novice. After resisting much persuasion on the part of his friend to follow his example, he was attracted by a fine library he found in the monastery, and moved by his friend's description of the life at Stein, which he represented as not only a paradise upon earth, but also a temple of the Muses. Finally he was induced to come and live in the monastery, first as tutor to his friend, then for a year as postulant; he was then admitted as a novice, and made his vows after a probation of two years. He speaks of all this in after years as the effect of undue influence exercised on his youth and inexperience. "What could a fine soul," he writes, "and a body such as mine do in a monastery? Nothing but what a fish would do in a field, or an ox in the sea."

Within the monastery of Stein, Erasmus made the acquaintance and friendship of learned men, and already the revival of classical studies in Italy had divided the students of the community into opposing parties. Erasmus threw himself warmly into the movement in favour of the classics, and adopted Valla, who was then at the head of the intellectual movement in Italy, as his guide and model. In advocating this cause he already manifested that keen, pungent, and lively wit, that passionate enthusiasm for literature, and that aversion to disputes and quarrels, which pervade all his writings from first to last. He

spent three years and a half at Stein, during which time he discovered that the monastery was not merely a shrine of the Muses. If he enjoyed the studies and the recreations of the community, he found much in the practice of its rule which was repugnant to his nature, and to which that nature would not conform itself, and under these circumstances he made the great mistake of not quitting the monastery before he bound himself by the solemn obligation of his vows.

Three treatises exist which were written by Erasmus during his residence at Stein: one, and the most important, entitled "Literature," which he afterwards published, in an enlarged and revised edition, under the title of *The Anti-barbarians*; another on "Peace;" a third on "Contempt of the world." From time to time he sought relief from the fatigues of study in the recreation of painting, and a Crucifixion is still shown which was painted by him while at the monastery, and which shows a moderate attainment in the art. His enemies accuse him of having sullied the traditions of Stein by gross and immoral irregularities. His friends boast of the purity, piety, and regularity of his life while he remained there. He himself confesses to having occasionally indulged the exuberance of his passions, but not in such a way as to become their slave. After having made his vows, his antipathy to monastic life increased daily; at the same time he respected the common opinion, that to quit the monastery would be to commit sacrilege, and he resigned himself to what he considered the necessity of not giving occasion for scandal. Chance threw in his way an opportunity of escape which he had not hoped for. De Bergues, Bishop of Cambrai, he tells us, "was aspiring to a Cardinal's hat, and would have attained it if his money had not failed him." The Bishop wished to retain in his service a man of talent who could write Latin with purity and elegance, in order to conduct his correspondence with the Court of Rome; and the reputation of Erasmus pointed him out as the man suited to his purpose. An agreement was soon made, and Erasmus contrived to leave Stein with the sanction of his Ordinary, the Bishop of Utrecht, the permission of the Prior of Stein and the General of his Order, and the consent of the whole community. He says that he did not consider his vows as valid, owing to their having been forced on him by an improper exercise of authority and influence, but that in order to preserve good feeling with his religious brethren, and that he might not cause scandal in weak

and ignorant people, he resolved to continue to wear the religious habit of his order.

Established in the household of the Bishop of Cambrai, Erasmus continued to correspond with those of the community at Stein who favoured the study of the classics, he succeeded in gaining a certain ascendancy over his new patron, and in forming some valuable friendships, amongst others that of James Battus, tutor to the Prince de Weere. But finding that the Bishop was an ambitious man, on whose constancy and sincerity he placed no reliance, he asked to be sent to Paris to complete his studies. The Bishop consented, made him a donation for travelling expenses and pocket money, and promised him an annual pension, which was never paid. Erasmus was now launched upon life in the great University of Paris, where he entered the College of Montaigu. There is conflicting evidence as to the year in which this happened, but it seems pretty certain that it was not sooner than 1491 nor later than 1492, which would make him twenty five or twenty six years of age at the time. Small in stature and delicate in constitution, he is described as of a most prepossessing mien, and his ardent spirit and brilliant intelligence beamed forth in his regular features and graceful form; his nervous system was highly irritable, and the irascible preponderated in his character; negligent to a fault, he was, like most men who devote themselves without reserve to the worship of the Muses, most helpless in the ordinary affairs of common life. He had an extraordinary power of throwing himself into the thoughts and affairs of other men and of giving himself entirely to those who were in his company, and like aameleon he could adopt without effort the hues of the substance upon which he rested. These qualities, joined to an exuberant, joyous, and genial temper, and an unceasing flow of conversation abundantly seasoned with Attic salt, made his society most attractive; he corresponded in fact to the signification of his own name—Gheraed, his patronymic, in French became Didier, in Latin Desiderius, in Greek, the language of his predilection, Erasmus. His epitaph, still to be seen in Basle, plays upon the signification of his name—

*Pallida mors magnum nobis accepit Erasmus
Sed Desiderium tollere non potuit.*

Erasmus was quite in his element in the University of Paris, and stored his hive from every flower of learning that grew

there. But we find a marked difference of tone and character in his mind from that of the Parisian scholars in general. It is evident that, as a rule, he did not like Frenchmen. His health after a time broke down from excessive study, which he attributed to the bad fare and hard living he had to endure at the College of Montaigu, from whence, he tells us, he carried away nothing but a "broken constitution and a large quantity of vermin." He returned to his native country to recruit his health, and, in his twenty-eighth year, was ordained priest by the Bishop of Utrecht. He spent ten days with his former patron, the Bishop of Cambrai, in hopes of pecuniary assistance. The Bishop received him with courtesy and much distinction, but needed all his resources for the expenses of the embassy to England with which he had just been intrusted, and Erasmus in his disappointment bitterly complains of his own evil fortune and the Bishop's want of liberality. Erasmus then returned to Paris, reinstated in health, but reduced to such poverty that he was forced to take pupils in order to subsist there. With the experience of want certain disagreeable features manifest themselves in his character. Of a haughty, independent, and self-confident disposition, he descends to fulsome flattery to others, vainglorious boasting of himself, and uses many mean devices in his search for contributors to his maintenance, and there is apparently great want of reason, as there certainly is great want of gratitude and modesty, in his bitter complaints of the illiberality of their gifts when he has obtained them. He corresponds with his friends at Stein, and receives assistance from them. The bent of his mind was never very much in the direction of speculative theology, and, having always avowed the greatest aversion to the Schoolmen, he announces to his correspondents at Stein that he has become a Scotist, and endeavours to impress them with the belief that his studies were of a much more theological character than could be supported by fact. At the same time he speaks of himself as though he were still a member of their community, and holds out the prospect of his returning to the monastery, an intention which he never for a moment entertained.

At Paris there was at this time a little colony of young Englishmen of high birth, completing their course of studies in the University under the care of private tutors, who exercised the office of guardian rather than that of instructor to their wards, and retained the services of professors in the University

for their private instruction supplementary to the public course of lectures. Erasmus, in his search for pupils, soon makes the acquaintance of our countrymen, who engage his services and remunerate them well. He was immediately attracted, he tells us, by the manly, frank, and ingenuous character of the young Englishmen, and became what in Paris would now be called an ardent "Anglomane," while they, by admitting him to their intimacy, showed that they reciprocated his esteem. Among his English pupils was the young Lord Mountjoy, high in favour with Henry the Seventh and afterwards with Henry the Eighth, who took an especial fancy to Erasmus, became his *Mæcenas*, and whose friendship exercised an important influence on his future destiny.

There is a greater obscurity as to this epoch than any other in the life of Erasmus, and there is a mystery about some affair with which he was connected, which led to his being unceremoniously ejected from the house by the tutor of two young Englishmen to whom he was giving lectures. One of his letters is full of passionate abuse of this tutor. But the quarrel appears to have been with the tutor alone, for though the young gentlemen were withdrawn from his oral teaching he continued to direct their studies by letters, and there is nothing to indicate that his affectionate relations with them were disturbed by what had passed. The occurrence, however, seems to have led him to quit Paris suddenly and return to his native country. Erasmus already enjoyed the reputation of being among the first scholars of the day, but his revenues did not correspond with the growth of his reputation, and his needy circumstances interfered with his comfort and barred the road to the objects of his ambition. He put himself forward as the champion of classical studies and polite literature, and called upon the friends of learning to support him. In military phrase, he began to "levy requisitions," though he enforced them by the pen instead of the sword. To those who showed him favour, especially if it was shown through the medium of liberal gifts, he offered the immortal honours of the dedication of his works and association with his name, and the present enjoyment of his society and friendship, while the popularity of his writings, and the pungency of his irony and sarcasm, already made him feared by those who might be disposed to offend him. He bitterly inveighs in his letters against those who declined to supply him, or supplied him insufficiently, with the means of prosecuting the ends he had

proposed to himself in life, as though they had failed in an obligation of justice.

His friend Battus was at this time conducting the education of the young Prince de Weere, whose mother, a widow, was left sole administratrix of the large revenues he was to inherit on attaining his majority. The Princess was a weak, vain, and extravagant woman, unequal to her charge, and aspired to become the patroness of letters and learned men. As the vulture scents the carcase from afar, Erasmus discerned and prepared his flight upon his prey. He writes a letter full of extravagant expressions of friendship for Battus and flattery for the Princess. Nothing but his poverty withholds him from visiting the friend whose society is necessary to his existence. The answer brings an invitation and funds for his expenses, and Erasmus is soon upon the spot. His prolific pen pours out poems and prose compositions in praise of the Princess, in which flattery surpasses the limits of absurdity, and he effects a conquest. An annual pension of two hundred florins is granted to him, and he leaves with the present of a horse and money for the expenses of his return to Paris. On his arrival in Paris he writes complaining of the smallness of the sum given to him, tells a story of his portmanteau falling from his saddle on the journey, by which accident all his effects and the Princess' presents were lost, and begs for fresh remittances. Battus answers by a flat refusal, and treats the story of the portmanteau as a fable. Irritable and violent as Erasmus was, he could always control his expressions when his interests required it. He answers in a tone of despair that he must look elsewhere for succour, and would "let the winds carry him where they would, though he would not abandon the rudder nor the sails, since he hoped to reach some shore or other, though it might not be the haven of his wishes." He hints here at his intended visit to Lord Mountjoy in England. Italy was at that time the land of promise to a scholar of the *cinqe cento*, and no reputation was held to be established without a visit to that classic country. But want of means compelled him to postpone the pilgrimage of his desires. It is painful to see the mean devices to which Erasmus condescended in order to extort money from the Princess de Weere. On another occasion, when he had returned with a full purse from a visit to her, he invents a story of having been robbed by brigands on the road of all her gifts, and moves her compassion, by a well told fiction, to renew her liberality.

We shall see that he did not long enjoy the pension she had granted him, for, in less than two years from this time, her extravagance and mismanagement having brought her son to the verge of ruin, the law stepped in, trustees were appointed, her administration was limited to a moderate jointure, and Erasmus' pension was stopped.

Lord Mountjoy, the former pupil and future patron of Erasmus, was living at the Court of Henry the Seventh, and on the point of being married, when Erasmus proposed to accept his long proffered hospitality in England. The invitation is renewed, funds are supplied for the journey, and in the autumn of 1499 Erasmus finds a warm welcome in England. His fame had preceded him, and he met with a cordial reception from the *savants* of this country. Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, both afterwards martyrs for the Faith, were among the first and most constant friendships which he formed in this visit. He visits Fisher on his way from Dover, and More had been invited to meet him by Lord Mountjoy, who was then staying at his country house on the eve of his marriage, pending which event More is charged with the entertainment of Erasmus. The young Princes and Princesses were staying at the time at one of the royal residences almost adjoining Lord Mountjoy's park, and Erasmus is presented to them, joins them in a walk through the grounds, and afterwards dines with them. Prince Arther was not present. Erasmus describes Prince Henry, then only in his tenth year, as "already displaying a royal soul, a great elevation in his sentiments, and a marvellous goodness." Princess Margaret, afterwards Queen of Scotland, was by one year older than Prince Henry. Princess Mary, only four years of age, was amusing herself with her toys, and Prince Edmund, a baby in arms, was carried by his nurse. After saluting Prince Henry, More, who was as accomplished as a courtier as he was as a philosopher, presents him with a copy of verses. Erasmus is irritated at this, and reproaches More for not giving him previous intimation of this opportunity of making a similar offering. He is covered with confusion when the Prince, who had probably received his cue from More, asks him during dinner to give him a sample of his compositions. Erasmus hurries back to Lord Mountjoy's, shuts himself up in his room, and at the end of three days produces, "in spite of the Muses," a long poem in praise of the Prince, the Princesses, the King, and all the royal family. More then carries him to Oxford,

where Lord Mountjoy was to join them as soon as his honeymoon was over.

Here Erasmus was quite in his element. The Prior of St. Frideswide's, a monastery of the Canons Regular, held much the same position at that time (*mutatis mutandis*) that the deans of Christ's Church, whose College stands on the same site, do at present in Oxford relatively to the rest of the academic body. The Prior Charnock was a most polished man and accomplished scholar, and showed Erasmus much kindness and civility. He was a warm supporter of the revival of the classics, and on receiving the visit of More and Erasmus, whom he treated with all the marks of honour, he produced some verses he had just addressed to Sixtinus, a native of Holland, and a "poet of his own order" (this was a hit at Erasmus, who still wore the habit of the Canons Regular). Erasmus does not know how to praise the verses sufficiently. He talks of their "easy and delicate style," their "poetic sap worthy of the ancient masters," their "Attic grace," their "marvellous sweetness," and so on. The Prior upon this composes some verses in honour of Erasmus, in which he invites him, by continuing to cultivate the Muses, to show to the world that the Germans are in no way inferior in genius to the Italians. At this time John Colet was living at Oxford, and giving public lectures on the Epistles of St. Paul. He was afterwards dean of St. Paul's in London, an able and distinguished man, but a rash and dangerous theologian. He depreciated the teaching of the Schoolmen, and professed to restore to its pristine grandeur the Patristic theology of the ancient Church. He was, in fact, one of the precursors of the Reformation. While studying in Paris he had frequently heard of Erasmus, and now became, like the Prior of St. Frideswide's, his intimate friend.

Writing to Lord Mountjoy, who found himself too much charmed by the amenities of married life to join him at Oxford, Erasmus says, "With two such friends"—Colet and the Prior—"I should be content to dwell in the extremities of Scythia." Colet urges him to lecture at Oxford on the Books of Moses and the Prophet Isaias. This Erasmus declines to do, but he promises to labour with him "in the restoration of sacred studies," since rhetoric and poetry had ceased to have attractions for him now that they had ceased to be necessary for his maintenance. Erasmus published while at Oxford a treatise on Jesus Christ in the Garden of Gethsemani, and his book on

the Epistolary Art, which he dedicated, like many of his later works, to his patron, Lord Mountjoy.

Day by day his enthusiasm for England increases. He expresses his admiration of this country and his friends at Oxford in a letter to a friend in Italy, "a country," he writes, "where the walls are more eloquent than the men of other countries."

I should myself already have been there [in Italy], but that the Earl of Mountjoy called me to England at the very moment when I was preparing for my journey. But where would I not follow that young lord, who is so good, so generous, so amiable? You wonder what charm I can find in England, and you cannot believe me, but no country as yet has delighted me in the same degree. I have found here a climate as agreeable as it is healthy, and such lights! so much science, at once profound, exquisite, and antique! that I am no longer eager to visit Italy. When I listen to my friend Colet, I seem to be sitting at the feet of Plato himself. Who would not admire the encyclopædia of knowledge in Grocinius? Or what can be more penetrating, more exalted, more delicate, than the judgment of Linacre? Has Nature ever produced anything more amiable, more sweet, more happy, than the genius of Thomas More? One can scarce believe what a rich harvest is being prepared here, on all sides, for ancient literature.

About the same time he makes confidences of a different kind to his friend Faustinus Andrelin, the poet laureate at the Court of France, confidences which we should hardly expect from a priest and a grave theologian.

We too [he writes] have reaped profit in England. That Erasmus, whom you knew formerly, has already become a good sportsman, no contemptible horseman, and a subtle courtier. He makes his bows with grace, smiles affably, and all that in spite of Minerva! What matters? I am getting on here famously. You too, if you are wise, will lose no time in coming here. What pleasure can you find, you with your fine intellect, in keeping watch over *that dunghill* of France? If you only knew the prerogatives of England, you would find wings to carry you hither, and you would find here nymphs of a divine beauty, whose worship you would soon prefer to that of your Muses. They have a custom here which one cannot sufficiently applaud. Wherever you call, you are embraced; you take leave, and are embraced again. You call again, and are again embraced. People visit you, and they embrace you; they embrace you again on leaving. On meeting people in the street, one embraces them. In short, whichever way you turn, you find nothing but fresh embraces. Had you but tasted, as I have done, the sweetness, the agreeable perfume of society here, you would assuredly make up your mind to travel in England, not for a year, or for ten years, but till the day of your death.

While Erasmus was writing this letter, he was preparing for his departure from England for France. His statements are not always sincere, and according as circumstances affected him he could apply enthusiastic praise or the fiercest invective to the same subject. He could be bitter enough on the subject of England when his interests did not prosper there. His letters

abound with opinions on England and the English, but, as they are generally written with a purpose, not much reliance can be placed on them. His genuine judgment on this country may be found in instructions given by him to his secretary, whom he was sending to England, a short time before his death. His remarks might be written by a foreigner of the present day, and are perfectly sincere.

Beware, in entering the country, of thieves and sailors, they are one and the same thing [he writes], but you may derive great fruit from your voyage to England. The great men there do not always think in the bottom of their hearts what their countenances express. It is necessary to speak to them with a religious fear as men in ancient times used to speak to the gods. For the rest, they are a liberal nation, while here in Brabant the people are quite the reverse. You must learn how to refuse a present, which is a difficult art. In England you must never appear to be greedy, and take example from Erasmus in this. You will easily find yourself on good footing with everybody there if you will only consent to imitate a polypus: uncover your head, shake hands, smile on being introduced, wherever you go—above all, be cautious never to betray contempt or criticism of anything pertaining to that nation, for it is a nation *marvellously in love with itself*.

Nothing could have been more flattering or cordial than the reception Erasmus had met with in England; at the Court, in the Universities, by the most influential patrons of learning, he had been received with open arms, and, in order to secure his permanent residence in the country, more than one ecclesiastical benefice had been offered to him, and he had been appointed Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, but he did not accept the benefices, or enter upon the duties of professor. If we were to argue from the needy circumstances in which he had started for this country, or indeed from his own professions, we might conclude that such a position as was offered to him in England would have been the height of his ambition. Erasmus was insincere in many things; he was inconstant in all things except one—the pursuit of knowledge and fame, and the promotion of literature. This he made his end in life, and he pursued it with a singleness of aim and constancy of purpose which, when united to great talents and activity, are among the principal conditions of success. Like M. Thiers, at present, in France, Erasmus was aspiring to establish a new republic, the republic of letters, in Europe, and to make himself its founder and president, and it is clear that he never seriously entertained an intention of fixing his abode permanently among the *divisos orbe*. We hope we shall be excused for dwelling upon Erasmus' connection with England longer than the symmetry, and proportion with the limits, of this article would permit: the

establishment of his fortune, reputation, and future influence were the results of this visit.

With all his consummate tact in important matters, Erasmus was helpless in the extreme, and always getting into scrapes in the ordinary affairs of daily life. There was a law in this country in the time of Henry the Seventh which made it penal to carry coin beyond the seas, and travellers were only allowed to carry on their persons what was absolutely necessary to enable them to reach the frontiers. More and Lord Mountjoy had assured Erasmus that the regulation only applied to English money, and he tells us that he had restricted himself to twenty pounds, a part of which was in foreign coinage. The whole of this sum was seized and taken from him on his arriving at Dover. It does not appear whether Erasmus was contumacious with the officers of the Crown, or how he incurred his penalty, but he was most roughly treated, and was thrown into prison, where he was for a considerable time under restraint, and from whence Lord Mountjoy at last was only able to effect his liberation at the expense of much money, time, and trouble. This was a terrible humiliation to serve as climax to the glories of the English visit, and, though Erasmus bore it with great fortitude, it was several months before he could speak of the English except as "harpies who did not know how to respect the Muses and their client." Released from prison, and safely landed beyond the Channel, he flies to the Princess de Weere, where his friend Battus acts the part of the good Samaritan, and where he arranges his ruffled plumage beneath the soothing care and compliments of the Princess.

With a purse replenished he soon starts for Paris, but here again he came to unexpected grief. He reached Amiens in safety, where, having suspicions of a portion of the road which traversed some wild country in the direction of Paris, he joined himself to an Englishman who was journeying to the same point. The ordinary means of transit at that time was the saddle horse. Relays of horses were stationed along the roads, and a peasant on horseback followed the traveller, leading, where this was required, a pack horse for baggage, and bringing back the team at the end of the stage. On arriving at a lonely hostelry at night, Erasmus and his companion found themselves in a nest of thieves, and the peasant in charge of their horses in league with the robbers. As the night advanced, affairs became more and more threatening, and at last, having barricaded the door,

they mounted guard by turns, one armed with a sword and a gauntlet of mail, the only defensive weapons at hand, while the other slept. The Englishman was a stout resolute man, but if we believe Erasmus' version, he was the hero of the adventure. Perhaps the Englishman would have told a different story, for when day broke, Erasmus, after secreting a few valuables on his person, crept down a back stair under the pretence of saying mass in a neighbouring church, and ran for his life, leaving his papers and other baggage on the field of battle, and the Englishman to his fate.

On reaching Paris, Erasmus was soon busied in his edition of the Works of St. Jerome, and published his collection of Proverbs, some notes on Cicero's Offices, and other small works. He lost his pension from the Princess de Weere about this time, and his friend Battus dying soon after, he had so much difficulty in maintaining himself, that he entertained the idea of returning to England for fresh supplies. But, though poor in pocket, his reputation and influence had increased almost indefinitely since his reception in England, and he had become an oracle in the University and the learned world in general. Those who had neglected him heretofore were now at his feet, and fame seemed to woo him in proportion as he pretended to scorn her. He assumed the language of an apostle of literature, and basing his teaching on a Papal decree which recommended a knowledge of the three learned languages as essential for the perfect understanding of Holy Scripture, he laboured to draw the studies of the University to the fountain head of theology and the critical exposition of the original text. He devoted a portion of each day to the study of Greek, and exhorted others to do the same. Erasmus disliked France, yet he was drawn to Paris by the consciousness that it was the principal centre of mental activity in the north of Europe, and it is worth remarking, that in no country have his writings attracted more attention than in France. The French editions of his works far outnumber those of any other country, and his three most recent biographers have all been Frenchmen. Of these, most people will find Marsollier and Burigny* too favourable in their apologies of Erasmus, and too partial to their subject, but M. de Laur has quite recently given us two volumes in which he lays the life and spirit of the great

* Marsollier, *Apologie d'Erasmus*. Paris, 1713. Burigny, *Vie d'Erasmus*. 2 vols., 12mo. Paris. Erasmus *Precurseur et initiateur de l'Esprit moderne*. Par H. Durand de Laur. Didier et Cie. Paris, 1872.

Dutchman before us with great fairness, and leaves the reader to form his own judgment of him.

The teaching of Erasmus caused considerable stir and ferment in the University of Paris, more especially in the faculty of theology: he had found a fulcrum for his lever, and he was beginning to move the world, but before he had made himself fully felt, Paris was visited by the plague, and the whole academic body was forced to take flight from the capital. Erasmus went in the first instance to Orleans, where he continued his labours for a few months in the private house of a friend, hoping to return to Paris. The books he carried with him were the works of Origen, St. Jerome (of which he was preparing an edition), St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, Nicolas de Lyra, and other commentators on St. Paul, and Plautus and Terence. The plague breaking out at Orleans, and continuing to rage in Paris, he was forced to quit, and took up his abode at Louvain. Here he published his *Manual of Piety*, a book of Catholic devotions, and was much mortified by the remark of a friend, whose judgment of the book he had asked for, that he had "found more piety in the book than in its author." On the Feast of the Epiphany, 1504, he was deputed to pronounce the panegyric on King Philip of Spain, who was present on the occasion with his Court and a numerous and distinguished audience, in the palace at Brussels. Louvain became from this time the usual domicile of Erasmus: geographically, as well as in other respects, it suited his object. The University there, already celebrated, had received a fresh impulse under Spanish patronage, and Erasmus, whose reputation was daily increasing, had risen to favour with the Court through the influence of his friend, Tunstall, then the English Ambassador at Brussels. We find Erasmus again visiting England in the summer of the following year by a special invitation, accompanied with the promise of a benefice, from the King. He was lodged, on arriving, at Lambeth, with Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, and afterwards with his old friend and patron, Lord Mountjoy. Nothing comes of the promise of preferment, but an arrangement is made for him to visit Italy. The King's physician, Signor Boerio, an Italian, was about to send his sons to tour in their native country under the charge of a private tutor, and it was agreed that Erasmus should join the party and form, what he calls, "the Italian Convention." He was thus enabled to accomplish in his mature age what had always been the dream of his youth. A

letter has been preserved which was written on this occasion by Prince Henry, now heir-apparent to the throne of England, to Erasmus, and which does great credit to the heart and head of the young Prince, and proves that he had formed a great attachment to Erasmus during this visit to England.

Erasmus started for Italy towards the end of the summer of 1506. His tour, which extended over a period of three years and a half, comprised Turin, Venice, Bologna, Padua, Siena, and Rome. He spent a considerable time at Bologna. This appears to have been with the design of getting rid of the young Boerios, at all events it had this effect. What is vulgarly called "bear-leading" was not at all to the taste of Erasmus. While at Bologna he wrote several of his smaller works, and was urged to give lectures in the University, but he declined to do this from a conviction that his northern pronunciation of Latin would have ruined his success with Italians. War was going on at the time in Italy, and he was attacked by an excited mob in the streets of Bologna, an attack from which he narrowly escaped with his life. Finding that this attack was owing to a mistake arising from the religious habit which he wore, he wrote to Pope Julius the Second and obtained from him a dispensation from his vows. Erasmus spent eight months with Aldus Manutius, the great printer of the day, at Venice, where he made several distinguished acquaintances, amongst others that of Jerome Aleandro, then as yet in an humble position, but afterwards the Legate who executed the Bull of Pope Leo the Tenth against Luther. Aldus undertook an edition of Erasmus' collection of Proverbs, and new editions by him of some of the plays of Sophocles, and revisions of the text of Terence and Plautus. For the last named twenty crowns were paid. The reputation of Erasmus continued to increase daily. A natural son of James the Fourth of Scotland, who, at the age of twenty, was already Archbishop of St. Andrews, and who was preparing for the duties of his office by a course of studies at Padua, prevailed on Erasmus to undertake the superintendence of his studies. This arrangement served to introduce Erasmus to the renowned University of Padua and the many learned men residing there, among whom was the celebrated refugee, Marcus Musurus. The climate of Padua did not agree either with Erasmus or his Archiepiscopal pupil, and they moved from thence to Siena, where, finding himself so near Rome, Erasmus obtained leave of absence to visit the Eternal City. Here he

was received with enthusiasm by all those most celebrated for learning and the chief patrons of letters. John de Medicis, then Cardinal, afterwards Pope Leo the Tenth, conceived a great esteem for Erasmus, and warmly patronized him both at that time and after he had assumed the tiara. Cardinals Grimani, San Giorgio, Bembo, and Gilles were among those who formed intimate acquaintance with Erasmus while in Rome and continued to correspond with him after his departure. All these in turn strongly urged him to fix his abode in Rome, and the appointment of Penitentiary was offered to him as a commencement in his career of dignities. He excused himself on the ground that he was pledged, by a promise to the King, to return to England.

While in Rome he had received a letter from Lord Mountjoy, announcing to him the accession of Henry the Eighth to the throne, and the joy and exultation of the English people on the occasion. "The end of your misfortunes has arrived," he continues, "you are now called to come to the presence of the King of England, who will say to you, 'be rich, and be the greatest of poets.'" Lord Mountjoy inclosed £5 towards the expenses of his journey to England, and the same sum from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who added the promise of a benefice on his arrival. Erasmus hastened back to Siena, to take his leave of the Archbishop of St. Andrews, and, after spending three years and a half in Italy, started for his third visit to England in the spring of the year 1510. The Archbishop of St. Andrews left Italy soon afterwards, and arrived in Scotland just in time to join the army which was marching against England, and died, fighting side by side with the King, his father, at the battle of Flodden. Erasmus came to England with the expectation of wealth and, what he valued far more, independence for the rest of his life. He left Italy and his prospects in Rome with great reluctance. No country, he tells us, ever suited his tastes so completely as Italy, and he found in Rome that which satisfied all the aspirations of his life. He was, however, disappointed in England. The King received him indeed with all the marks of favour and friendship, but nothing more was said on the subject of preferment. Erasmus was lodged for several months in More's house, where Ammonio di Lucca, the Pope's Nuncio, also had an apartment. The closest bond of intimacy existed between the members of this trio, who became the centre of a distinguished and very charming

society. Ammonio, who was a most cultivated and accomplished man, after he ceased to be Nuncio, became Secretary to the King, and was always most constant and considerate in his friendship for Erasmus. The whole of the year 1512, and a great part of the preceding and following year, appear to have been spent by Erasmus at Cambridge, where he taught publicly, and published several of his works. He completed here his edition of the New Testament, Greek and Latin, with annotations, and his "restoration" of the works of St. Jerome. Warham, Archbishop of Canterbury, presented him with the living of Adlington, which he renounced in consideration of an annual pension of one hundred crowns out of its revenues. Lord Mountjoy made him an annual allowance to the same amount, and Wolsey was told by the King to provide some suitable preferment for Erasmus. The King had just made conquest of Douai and Tournai in his campaign in France, and Wolsey fulfilled the King's injunction by presenting Erasmus with a prebendary stall then vacant in Tournai. A question arose with the French Bishop as to the right of nomination, and the Bishop resigned his see. Wolsey was then made administrator of the diocese, and in the dispute gave the stall destined for Erasmus to another. Lord Mountjoy and Sir Thomas More come to Tournai to support Erasmus' claim, and succeed in establishing him in the appointment. Wolsey, now Archbishop of York and Chancellor, treats the appointment as unworthy of Erasmus, and promises greater things for him. Some charming traits of Sir Thomas More are recorded in connection with this transaction, which show the ingenuous candour of his soul and his delicate consideration for the interests of his friend.

About this time we find Erasmus for the first time taking part in public affairs, and some considerations which he submitted to the Emperor Maximilian appear to have had great influence in preventing war. They also secured for him the high esteem of Prince Charles, who, on his coronation as Emperor Charles the Fifth, appointed Erasmus Councillor of State to the Empire, an office which, though not very lucrative, gave him importance and reputation, without any duties which curtailed his freedom of action. The power of the press, then comparatively a new institution in Europe, was at this time enormous, not greater than that which it exercises at present, but, owing to the business being in the hands of a few, the power of the individual printer greatly exceeded that of those of own own times. With the concurrence

and under the patronage of the *savants* of Germany, Froben of Basle had inaugurated a rival establishment to that of Aldus, which had become the centre of typocracy in the north of Europe. With the view of settling a dispute which had arisen concerning the publication of some of his writings, Erasmus, after taking leave of Lord Mountjoy, who had just been appointed Governor of Ham, and leaving Ammonio (the Pope's Nuncio) and More to watch over his interests in England, went to Basle and took up his abode there. From this time Basle may be almost considered as a domicile of Erasmus as well as Louvain, owing to his frequent visits and residence there, although more of his time was spent at the latter place. And this twofold residence very well represents to us the intellectual attitude which Erasmus assumed and preserved to the day of his death. In Louvain he lived in the centre of the theologians and learned men of the University, being himself the greatest name among their number, while at Basle his intimacy with Froben, the great printer, served him as a means of communication and alliance with all the stirring intellects of Germany. Among these, and the especial admirers of Erasmus, were to be found the names of all the leaders of the "Reformation." All were more or less known to him—Hutten, *Æcolampadius*, Melancthon, were among his intimate friends. Letters of mutual admiration passed between him and Luther. There was not one of any note (if we except Calvin) who did not claim Erasmus as his patron and friend. The political causes which produced the Reformation were already active in Germany, and every restless spirit in quest of notoriety found the surest road to it in the revival of classical studies of which Erasmus was the oracle, the Prometheus supposed to have stolen fire from the gods.

Besides the work of writing and publishing his own books, and directing the literary labours of others, Erasmus kept up a vast correspondence with almost every country in Europe. Popes Julius the Second, Leo the Tenth, Paul the Third, several of the most influential of the Cardinals in Rome, and almost every literary man of distinction in Europe, communicated with him, and his letters were everywhere regarded as literary treasures; many considered their reputation established—there were none who were not flattered and pleased—by receiving a letter from Erasmus. His morbid sensitiveness to praise or criticism was one of the weakest points in his character, and at Basle he met with nothing but enthusiastic admiration.

But at Louvain, Erasmus was at once in conflict with a large section of the professors, both of the humanities and the theological faculty. With the former, and with a considerable number of the latter, their opposition to him arose purely from that jealousy and envy with which inferior men instinctively assail whatever surpasses their own standard or proceeds on a method different to their own. But as in the University of Louvain all theological teaching had been reduced to the syllogistic method of Aristotle and the schools, Erasmus appeared to the latter as an innovator. He considered it to be his mission to raise the standard of studies in general, both sacred and profane, and in order to supply what he held to be the deficiencies of the prevailing systems of theological teaching, he opposed to them the philosophy of Plato, and a theology which was hermeneutic, exegetical, and patristic. This was one fruitful source of contention. Then again Erasmus appeared at Louvain, where the theological teaching was, almost exclusively, committed to the care of members of religious orders, as an apostate monk—as one who had abandoned his monastery and the observance of his vows. This, as might be expected, was made the occasion of reflections, which were very galling to his nature, and which he was not slow to resent. Erasmus was not an uncommon instance of the union of a very ardent and affectionate nature with an excessive irritability and pugnacity. He was a great lover of peace; he preached it incessantly, but was always ready to enter upon a quarrel in defence of its interests. Like a modern professor of peace, he “discharged his olive branches from a catapult.” No Protestant ever wrote with greater acrimony, or with less respect of persons, or perhaps even more offensively to pious ears, against ecclesiastics and members of religious orders, than Erasmus. This was the origin of a literary warfare, in which Erasmus was involved soon after his arrival at Louvain, and which only ceased with his life. The attitude he assumed towards the Reformation served to envenom that warfare, and brought upon him the hostility of many of the staunchest defenders of the Catholic doctrines.

At the commencement of the Reformation, its leaders were his personal friends, and he carefully abstained from any act or word which could offend them or estrange them from him. There is much in his conduct on this head that is very questionable. He perfectly saw and understood the gravity of the disorders which threatened the Church, and wrote to the Pope

and the Cardinals at Rome, urging them to take measures to heal the growing evils, and warning them of their dangerous tendencies. These letters display great foresight and penetration. He afterwards blamed the Pope for allowing matters to grow to a head before a remedy was attempted, and then for being severe when the time for severity had passed. But dwelling, as one may say, on the field of battle itself, he assumed the position of a neutral, and, like all neutrals in time of war, he brought upon himself the blows of both the contending parties. Early in the struggle he appeared really to favour the new opinions. "Do what you are doing thoroughly," he writes to Luther, who consulted him by letter after he was in open rebellion and had burned the Bull of the Pope at Wittemberg, "only act always in the interest of Jesus Christ and of sound learning, and abstain from violence in your acts which will bring disgrace upon your cause and trouble upon yourself." In the fierce conflict which arose, it may easily be conceived how the enemies of Erasmus were ready to exaggerate and accuse him of Lutheranism. The preaching friars, his old enemies, denounced him everywhere from the pulpit, while he satirized and ridiculed them with his pen.

At the meeting of Henry the Eighth of England and Francis the First of France, near Calais in the year 1520, for the gorgeous pageants and tournaments which gained for the place of meeting the name of the "Field of Cloth of Gold," Erasmus attended the English gathering, and met with many of his old friends. Lord Mountjoy, Sir Thomas More, Ammonio, Tunstall, and others were present. Wolsey, who was just verging upon the zenith of his power, was also there. Erasmus had several interviews with him, but says nothing of what passed between them. Like the rest of the world, he feared and flattered Wolsey when in power, and abused him when he fell.

In virtue of his office as Councillor of State to the Empire, Erasmus assisted at the Diet at Cologne. Here, again, he strongly advocated lenient measures towards Luther and the Reformers. He joined himself to, and became the head of, a party of men about the person of the Emperor, who called themselves "Humanists," and who, under the pretence of advancing classical studies and literature, secretly supported the Reformation. More than this. Erasmus appears on this occasion to have been the means of providing that protection to Luther, without which, in the opinion of many, his schism must have come to an end.

Luther had been cited to Rome, and the German Princes had been called upon to surrender his person to the authorities of the Holy See. The Emperor was disposed to do this, but, swayed by the advice of some of the members of his Council, he took no active steps in the matter. It was at this juncture that the Elector of Saxony (at that time, after the Emperor, the most influential Prince in Germany) sought the advice of Erasmus. We have an account of their interview on this occasion. The Elector began by asking Erasmus what he thought of "Luther's affair." "Luther," Erasmus answered, "has sinned in two points. He has touched the tiara of the Pope and the bellies of the monks." The Elector laughed, but on his insisting that he wished to talk seriously on the matter, Erasmus blamed the conduct of the Holy See throughout, and said that the Pope had been supine when he ought to have taken vigorous measures which would have put an end to the movement, and that now, when lenient and persuasive measures were the only remedy, he was disposed to use severity. It was upon this that the Elector took Luther under his protection, and thus enabled him to continue to set all authority at defiance.

Erasmus was everywhere in great demand at this time. Francis the First invited him to come to Paris, to preside over a college of *savants* which he wished to establish for the advancement of learning in his dominions, with a salary of two thousand crowns. Henry the Eighth of England, as though in rivalry of the French King, made him the same offer, naming precisely the same sum for his pension. Cardinal Ximenes called him to Spain, to aid him in the establishment of his University which he was then founding at Alcala. Erasmus declined these offers, probably as likely to limit his independence, and as requiring his residence in the countries to which they referred. He avows another motive for refusing to go to Spain, which seems to imply that he had doubts as to his own orthodoxy. He says that he would have accepted the Cardinal's invitation, had he not been afraid of the Inquisition and the Dominican Friars, who were "too powerful in Spain." He had, in fact become an object of suspicion to the theologians who were opposing the doctrines of the Reformation, and as there were many things in his writings that were questionable and seemed to favour the new opinions, he was perpetually assailed by them and involved in controversies. Lee in England, Lefebvre in France, Stunica in Spain, Scaliger in Italy, with

many more, denounced him as an insidious and secret enemy of the Church. Erasmus never ceased to assert his neutrality in the matter of the Reformation; but he took care from this time to separate his own cause from that of Luther and his associates, while he fiercely repelled the accusation of heterodoxy brought against him everywhere by the Catholics.

His last voyage to England—"a country," he said, "to which he owed more than to any other in the world"—was undertaken with a view of clearing his reputation from the charges brought against him. He had prepared a second edition of his New Testament, in which he had corrected most of the passages to which theologians had taken exception, and he wrote to the Pope asking permission to dedicate the book to His Holiness. Erasmus had already been denounced at Rome, yet Leo the Tenth's answer was everything that he could have desired, and he printed the Pope's letter as a preface to the new edition. With this he hurried to England, and presented it to Wolsey—who was then thought likely to be the Pope's successor—to the King, and to his most influential friends in England. He paid a long visit to Fisher, at Rochester, before leaving the country. The result of this visit to England was a Brief, obtained from Leo the Tenth by the joint action of the English and Spanish Ambassadors at Rome, by which Erasmus hoped to impose silence on his enemies. The Brief praises the "probity of life and manners, the rare science and eminent virtues" for which Erasmus was distinguished, and which were "manifested in the monuments of his studies, celebrated throughout the whole world, and testified by the common suffrage of all the most learned men of the day," and concludes by assuring Erasmus of the especial goodwill and protection of the Pope. Erasmus tells us that the name of "heretic" had always frightened him from his childhood, and that the accusations of his enemies had invested it with new terrors for him. This Brief of the Pope greatly reassured him.

A number of little books had been disseminated in Germany, published anonymously, but imitating the style of Erasmus, and quoting his words, in which the doctrines of the Reformation were advocated. This was a trick on the part of the Lutheran faction—and the printers, who almost without exception favoured the Reformation—to gain the influence of the name of Erasmus for their cause. Erasmus was for a long time believed, by both parties, to be the author of these books, and he submitted to

the imputation. But at last he entirely disavowed all connection with them, and there is nothing to support the opinion, which continued to be held, that this disavowal was not entirely genuine and true in fact. By degrees he withdrew more and more from the Reformers, and applied epithets in speaking or writing of them which implied his disapproval of them. But, though summoned to the Diet of Worms as Councillor of State, he refused to attend it, in order that he might not give any opinion, adverse or favourable, on Luther's cause. Pressed by the friends of Luther to declare his mind on the points at issue, he expressed himself as follows—"I am neither his (Luther's) counsellor, nor patron, nor agent, nor judge. If I am not mistaken, we have neither written the same things nor in the same manner. You exhort me to join him. I would do so readily if I saw him on the side of the Catholic Church. But if this state of confusion should reach such a pitch that the Church should be balanced equally between the opposite parties, I shall fix myself like a rock, waiting till, this storm having passed, one can see clearly where the Church is, and then Erasmus will be found there where the peace of Jesus Christ is to be found." When driven to a formal expression of his opinion, he said that it was not his business to form a judgment, and that he submitted to the decision of the Pope and the Emperor. "If that decision is right," he said, "I shall have shown my wisdom; if it is wrong, in any case *I shall be safe.*"

Melancthon married about this time, and, after his marriage, sent friends to consult Erasmus upon what he had done. "If Philip is married," Erasmus replied, "it only remains to wish him joy, for what is done cannot be undone. What is the use of seeking advice now?" It was on this occasion that Erasmus uttered his famous witticism on the Reformation. "The Reformation," he said, "began like a tragedy; it seems likely to end like a comedy in the marriage of all the principal performers." In proportion as Erasmus dissociated himself from the Reformers he became the object of their attacks. Hutten fiercely denounced him, as an apostate who had abandoned the cause of Jesus Christ. Luther commenced a controversy with him on the subject of freewill, and a number of inferior writers charged him with cowardice, taunting him with being a Reformer at heart but wanting the courage of his convictions.

A short time before the death of Leo the Tenth the book of *Stunica* against Erasmus was shown to the Pope, and Leo's judgment of Erasmus for the first time wavered. "My cause was in danger," Erasmus writes, "when Leo died." On the death of Leo, Adrian Florent was made Pope, under the title of Adrian the Sixth. A native of Utrecht, and long a professor of theology in the University of Louvain, he was well known to Erasmus, who much admired his stern purity of life, but he feared his rigid and inflexible character in the event of his giving credit to the representations which were at that time rife in Rome charging him with heterodoxy. As soon as Adrian arrived in Rome—he was in Spain when elected by the Conclave—Erasmus wrote to him, warning him not to give credence to the venomous accusations of his enemies, or, at least, to suspend his judgment concerning them until such time as Erasmus could answer his accusers. "Up to this moment," he writes, "I have always manifested sentiments worthy of an orthodox Christian. I shall always be the same to the last day of my life. If I cannot obtain the approbation of either of the two parties now in conflict, I have the fullest confidence that my soul will obtain that of Jesus Christ." The Pope answered that Erasmus might make himself quite easy; that illnatured people had indeed denounced him at Rome, but that he, Adrian, was always slow to listen to accusations against men whose eminence exposed them more than others to the envy of their fellows. He exhorted him to exert the powers of his "incomparable" pen against Luther, and so become a champion in the cause of the Church; and, in order to aid him in the execution of this project, he proposed that Erasmus should come to live at Rome, where all the treasures of the Vatican library and other literary resources should be at his disposal. Erasmus joyfully accepted this proposal, and prepared at once to fulfil the Pope's wishes, but before this could be done Adrian died, scarcely completing the first year of his pontificate.

Adrian was succeeded by Clement the Seventh, a cousin of Leo the Tenth. Erasmus wrote to him soon after his elevation to the Papacy, claiming his protection against those who defamed him, and presenting to him his treatise on free will, which he had written against Luther. As happens in the correspondence of ladies, he makes his most important communication in his postscript. He conjures the Pope to pacify the religious agitation and war of opinions by which the world was convulsed,

especially in Germany, and assures him that he would restore peace among the princes if he would show himself impartial to all, and that he would bring back tranquillity to the minds of men if he would but give them "grounds to hope that certain things would be changed which might be changed without damage to religion." The Pope answered by a most flattering letter, inclosing a sum of money, and containing splendid promises for the future. Silence was imposed on Stunica, who was the most inveterate foe to Erasmus in Rome, and the Pope soon afterwards appointed Erasmus Provost of Deventer, an appointment to which a salary was attached, and grateful to him on account of his early associations with the place. Erasmus, notwithstanding this, continued to be assailed on all sides no less by the Lutherans than by the monks in the pulpit and the theologians in their writings and professional chairs, and as he was always ready to accept battle with all antagonists, however unworthy of him, his life became literally a "warfare upon the earth." It is wonderful that he could continue in the midst of such polemics to compose and publish his books, a labour from which he never desisted until his death. He never departed from that attitude of neutrality which he had assumed at the commencement of the struggle, and he continued to urge that tenderness, not severity, was the weapon by which Protestants ought to be encountered.

Aleandro, the Pope's Legate, was of a very different mind, and when he published, anonymously, a severe attack upon Erasmus, for what he considered his lukewarm indifference to the interests of religion, the latter, worn out by the long strife in which he had been engaged, left the Low Countries and took refuge at Basle. Erasmus always defended his conduct as proceeding from prudence, not from any want of zeal. "What is the use," he was accustomed to say, "of provoking those whom you cannot overcome?" At the request of Queen Catharine of England, he composed about this time a treatise on "Christian marriage." The Queen's motive in asking for the treatise is obvious. Erasmus sent her an exposition of the teaching of the Church on the Sacrament of Matrimony, but on this, as on every other occasion, he observed the strictest reticence on the subject of the divorce which the King was insisting upon.

On the death of Clement the Seventh, Cardinal Farnese had no sooner been elected Pope under the title of Paul the Third,

than he began to make arrangements for the assembly of an Œcumenical Council which might decree measures for the pacification of Europe, the definition of doctrine, and restoration of discipline. His first care was to select learned men from the countries of the north of Europe which were most infected by those disorders which the Council was intended to remedy, whom he might make consultors of the Church by creating them Cardinals, and the name of Erasmus was the first chosen by him for that dignity. The mode in which the dignity was offered to Erasmus was most flattering. A distinguished theologian was sent to him, bearing an autograph letter from the Pope, which, after much praise of his past labours for the public utility, offered him the dignity of Cardinal as the recognition of them by the Holy See, announced to him that the requisite revenues had been provided for him towards the due maintenance of his new dignity, and proposed that the crowning efforts of his useful life should be directed to the pacification of Europe and the triumph of the Church, adding that this conduct, if adopted, would have the effect of silencing his enemies and converting them into his admirers and friends. "Paul the Third has been pleased to speak of me in very honourable terms," Erasmus writes on this occasion to a friend, "and even proposes to plant me at Rome among the Cardinals—a wild weed among the garden herbs; . . . but I persist, as I always shall, in declining his offers. . . . What have I to do with such matters—I a man of a single day, expecting death at every moment and, so cruel are my sufferings, even desiring it? . . . It is not safe for me to put my foot out of my room, and in this state of health they wish to force me to undertake dignities and hats!" Erasmus had, in fact, been seized during the previous year by a dangerous illness, from which he never entirely recovered. In the midst of his sufferings he continued to write and wage war with those who attacked him; but in 1534 he published, among other books, his *Preparation for Death*, and declared to his friends that this subject, though it did not divert him from his studies, occupied his main attention, and was the chief direction of his thoughts. In May, 1535, he writes to a friend, "My soul is preparing itself to quit this miserable abode. If I am to live at all, I must abstain entirely from writing, and even from all kinds of study. For me to live without intercourse with books and literature, and in continual sufferings, is not to live: nevertheless, we are in the hands of God."

In August of the same year, Erasmus was carried to Basle from Fribourg, where he had been living, as a last resource. The air of Basle had always benefited his health more than that of any other city, and it was an experiment recommended to try whether his constitution had strength to rally under the influence of this change of air. Moreover his treatise on the "Art of Preaching" was in the hands of the printer at Basle and required his superintendence. At the same moment he was called to the Court of Charles the Fifth at Brussels, where an appointment with an ample salary awaited him; and his intention was, if he recovered sufficiently, to return to Brabant, and not to end his days in Basle, unless from necessity. His health improved during the summer, and he began to hope that he would be able, by descending the Rhine, to reach Brussels before the winter; but with autumn his malady returned in an aggravated form, and continued to grow more threatening in its character.

One of the most agreeable features in the character of Erasmus is the depth and sincerity of his friendships. His correspondence with Sir Thomas More reads like the letters of two favourite brothers. There was an identity in them of intellectual tastes and pursuits, and they loved one another with an affection which was quite romantic. But the heroism of religious sentiment in More only shines forth the more by contrast with Erasmus, in whom it was utterly wanting. The last letter of More to Erasmus was written from Chelsea after he had resigned the Chancellorship and before his imprisonment, and the tone of his letter, cheerful and serene as usual, shows that the shadow of coming events had passed before the vision of his mind. More anxious about the interests of his friend than his own misfortunes, his pure and ingenuous soul could see nothing in the attacks upon Erasmus—whose works had been prohibited in England and burned at the cross of St. Paul's—than the envy of his enemies; and his letter concludes with the most touching expressions of sympathy and friendship. The news of the death of Fisher and More affected Erasmus with the deepest grief. It appears to have shortened his life, which was waning fast; and as he could not share the heroic sentiments with which they had suffered, so he could not rise above his grief by contemplating the splendours of their reward. A most eloquent letter by him remains to us, written soon after he had received this sad intelligence. It displays the brilliant writer and the sincere friend. "More and I," he says, "were one soul in two bodies,

and this news will prove my death blow." But he condemns the heroic conduct of his friends. "I would have counselled them," he writes, "not to have openly opposed the tempest. 'But we must all know how to die for the truth,' you will say. Yes—but not for every truth. If a tyrant commands you to abjure Christ, or give your head, you must give your head. But it is one thing to be silent, and another thing to abjure."

Erasmus spent the next winter in arranging his papers under the pressure of great and constantly increasing bodily sufferings. He left an enormous mass of correspondence, consisting of intimate and affectionate letters from nearly every monarch in Europe, from Dukes, Cardinals, Bishops, Popes, and persons eminent for science. In his will, after a few legacies and bequests to intimate friends, he left the whole of his property in three equal portions, to poor and infirm persons, to young women without dowers (for the protection of their virtue), and to poor students who gave promise of future success by their industry and talent. He bore the long and protracted sufferings of his last illness with great patience and fortitude, and died about midnight between the 11th and 12th of July, 1536, with a prayer for mercy and the names of Jesus and Mary upon his lips.

J. H. W.

A Hymn of Prudentius.

A SHORT notice of Prudentius, and of the martyrs whom he has commemorated in the hymn of which a metrical translation is here attempted, may not be unacceptable to the general reader, familiar as the particulars of course are to the student of early Christian literature. Aurelius Clemens Prudentius was a native of Spain, of what city is uncertain. He was born A.D. 348, and rose to considerable dignities in the State. It is, however, chiefly as a writer of hymns and other religious poems that interest attaches to him; and this not so much for the poetic beauty or taste of his compositions, which belong to a period of literary decadence, as for the witness they afford to the doctrines of the Catholic Church and the habits of Christians at that early period. They may be regarded as preserving, in poetry, a monument analogous to that which the paintings on the walls of the Catacombs yield to us in the same point of view, and their testimony is equally striking. There is many a touching, and many a curious illustration of the *mores Catholici* in both. "A retrospective review" of the writings of Prudentius is, however, beyond the purpose of the present paper; and I shall merely add to the foregoing such details as may throw light upon the hymn of which an English version is subjoined.

This poem stands first in the collection of fourteen hymns entitled *Περὶ στεφάνων Liber*, which we may roughly render—"the Book of Crowns"—the crowns, namely, of the martyrs whom Prudentius has celebrated in them, of whom the first six are saints connected with Spain, the rest miscellaneous. It appears that the brothers Hemiterius (popularly called St. Madir) and Chelidonius were officers who had served with distinction in the Roman army, and were martyred for the faith at Calagurris (now Calahorra, in Old Castile). The Acts, or judicial records, of their martyrdom having been destroyed, Prudentius, in celebrating it, could only make use of such facts as had been handed down to his time by tradition. These are like what we usually find in similar cases—a generous refusal to sacrifice to idols, a

renunciation of the dignities of which idolatry was the condition, and a death bravely endured in consequence. But in the legend a very singular addition was made to this somewhat colourless account. It was said that immediately before the martyrs were slain, the ring of one of them and the scarf of the other were carried to the clouds by the winds, and that this miracle was taken as an assurance of the glory that awaited them as a reward of their faith and their purity, of which the gold ring and the white scarf were respectively the symbols.

The testimony of Prudentius amply proves the antiquity and celebrity of the *cultus* of these martyrs in Spain and elsewhere, and that a festival in their honour was held at Calahorra in the fourth century. This *cultus* afterwards spread into the other cities of Spain, especially since the time of Pope St. Gregory the Great; and it was observed with great solemnity at Burgos and Leon as late as the end of the seventeenth century. The bodies of SS. Hemiterius and Chelidonius are said to have been removed from Calahorra to the monastery of Leger, in the diocese of Pampeluna; and, according to some, afterwards brought back to Calahorra: according to others, conveyed to Sallers, in Catalonia, from whence some bones were taken for the town of Cardona on October 19, 1399. About all this, however, there is great uncertainty, except that the first of these translations is commemorated on October 31. What remained of the heads, severed from the bodies, was said to be possessed by the collegiate church of Santander, in the diocese of Burgos. A great part of the relics continued to be shown in a chapel of the Cathedral of Calahorra, named after these saints, which of course would be inconsistent with the alleged translation to Sallers. These details I take from the French *Vie des Saints, avec l'histoire de leur culte*, &c., t. iii., pp. 55—58. Paris, 1704; but what devotion may at present exist towards these saints, in places where their names were once so celebrated, I have no means of ascertaining. Alban Butler has a short notice of these martyrs, *Lives of the Saints*, March 3.

PRUDENTIUS' "BOOK OF CROWNS."

HYMN I.

In honour of the holy Martyrs Hemiterius and Chelidonius of Calahorra.

Inscribed in heaven two martyrs' names appear,
Written by Christ in characters of gold;
The same were read in gory letters here,
And Spain the wreath triumphantly doth hold.

God hath vouchsafed this place their bones should keep,
And to their bodies sepulture accord,
Which the warm tide of blood imbibed deep,
That from their twofold martyrdom outpoured.

The neighbouring folk who now inhabit there,
Where that most holy blood sank in the sands,
Visit the spot with vows and gifts and prayer,
For Rumour spreadeth wide throughout all lands

That in this place the world's great patrons be,
From whom true prayers an answer never lack ;
No man in vain addresses them ; for see,
With dried-up tears he joyfully goes back,

Feeling that every just request is heard ;
Such aid to us those intercessors bring,
Of prayer forgetting not a whispered word,
Straightway they bear it to the Eternal King.

And from the very source they can obtain
Abundant gifts, bright waters that diffuse
The healing needed for each suppliant's pain :
Christ to His martyrs nothing can refuse—

Martyrs whom neither bonds nor cruel death
From the confessing of One God could fright,
At cost of blood ; but thus to lose life's breath
Is well repaid by a far longer light.

Such death is splendid—worthy of the good—
To give unto the sword a network thin
Of woven veins, full surely else the food
Of dull disease ; and dying, victory win.

'Tis joy to feel the persecutor's knife,
A noble gate the wound doth open wide
Unto the just, whose soul leaps forth to life,
In that red fountain washed and purified.

As soldiers they full many a toil had known,
But, tried in warfare, now they serve the shrine ;
Instead of sash, Christ's girdle* they put on ;
The Cross, not Cæsar's flag, they choose for sign.

Nor the proud dragon-standard† now uprear,
But the bright Wood which did the dragon quell ;
They now disdain to wield the bloody spear,
Dig trench, or batter wall with engine fell.

* *Perenne cingulum*. The *cingulum*, or belt, was one of the most distinguishing parts of the accoutrement of a Roman soldier, and to have this taken from him was regarded as a most ignominious punishment.

† *Ventosis draconum . . . palliis*. Each cohort had for standard the figure of a dragon fixed on the point of a gilt spear. This figure consisted of purple cloth, not, as it would appear, painted or embroidered on the flat surface, but made up so as to resemble a dragon, with gaping jaws and long rolling tail. It was hollow, so as to be puffed out by the wind, which idea may indeed be conveyed by the epithet *ventosis*, though the same epithet, as used by Horace—*ventoso gloria curru*—will justify the translation I gave given. The officers who carried these dragon-standards were called *draconarii* (Cf. Pitiscus, *Lex. Antiq. Rom.*, art. "draco").

A Hymn of Prudentius.

It happened then from this world's haughty lord*

To Israel's second offspring orders came,
At altars where black idols were adored
To sacrifice, and so deny the name

Of Christ their King. Fury, begirt with steel,
Threatened free Faith; but she, unscared, desired
The scourge and axe and double hooks to feel;
The imprisoned neck hard chains in dungeon tired.

The torturer's hands now ply their cruel trade
O'er all the forum wide; the voice of faith
Stifling in blood: sank virtue 'neath the blade,
Or on the pile imbibed the flames of death.

To die by fire the just great sweetness found,
And sweet to feel the sword's unpitiful stroke.
Two brethren's hearts thus kindling, who were bound
Throughout their life by friendship's dearest yoke,

They stand prepared to suffer any fate:
To bow their neck the headsman's axe beneath,
After the echoing scourge or fiery grate,
By leopards to be torn, or lions' teeth.

"Shall we, Christ's sons, the form of God who wear,
Be this world's slaves, in Mammon's bonds confined
Oh, mingle not heaven's beams with darksome air!
Suffice it that our early life, consigned

To Cæsar's service, paid the debt entire
Of our first covenant; now 'tis time to pay
To God the things of God. Hence, ensigns dire!
And you, ye tribunes, take yourselves away!

And the gold collars† take away with you,
Of wounds in battle once the recompense;
In white-clad cohorts to be soldiers true
Of Christ, bright angel-hosts do call us hence.

He, yonder reigning on His lofty throne,
Those foul and silly idols doth condemn,
Whom, fashioning to yourselves, for gods you own,
And you, their foolish worshippers, with them."

As thus they spake, at once a thousand pains
Those holy martyrs whelm on every side;
Their hands are manacled in galling chains,
Their necks in weighty iron gorgets tied.

But oh, the oblivion of a silent age!
Extinguishing the record of such deeds,
The infidel long since destroyed the page,
Which else had taught us how a martyr bleeds,

* Perhaps Diocletian, under whom and his colleague, Maximian, took place the tenth persecution, A.D. 303.

† *Aureos . . . torques*, collars of twisted gold, given in reward of distinguished bravery. They were, however, regularly worn by the *draconarii*.

Envyng to learned times that they should tell
That passion's history for all future years,
The order, time, and way how it befel—
Sweet words to sound for ever in men's ears.

Yet this alone is what we cannot say,
Whether, in prison pent, their hair grew long,
Or of their torments reckon the array—
One fact remains, in memory fresh and strong,

That certain gifts were wafted to the sky,
Which their path thither plainly did portend.
Of one the ring,* faith's emblem, flew on high;
And from the other did a scarf† ascend,

Token of prayer. Breeze-borne, in depth of light
Soon hides itself from view the gleaming gold,
And the white woof escapes the eager sight,
Amid the stars men cannot it behold.

This all the people saw; the torturer saw,
And in amaze he stayed his hand awhile,
And at the miracle turned pale with awe—
Then smote he, not to lose his guerdon vile.

Believe ye now, ye Vascons,‡ though possessed
By error once, how pure the blood that fell
From those two victims, now with God at rest?
See, how that holy blood can demons quell,

Who, like devouring wolves, men's hearts beset,
Mix with the senses, choke the very soul;
Filled with his enemy, a man is set,
He foams in rage, his fierce eyes he doth roll.

Relief is sought for him—not his the blame
Of what he suffers; thou mayst hear him cry,
But see no torturing hand. How quails his frame,
As it were lashed, and yet no scourge is nigh!

Stretched out he is with cords you cannot see.
The martyr thus the demon vexeth much.
He tortures, burns him, chains him, so that he
Is fain to drop the body from his clutch,

* *Annulus*. The right of wearing gold rings was conferred on all Roman soldiers by the Emperor Severus (*Herodian*, iii., 25).

† *Orarium*, a napkin or handkerchief, consisting of a long strip of linen, in shape like a modern scarf. As this was used for wiping the lips (deriving its name from *os*, *oris*), it is taken here as a symbol of prayer. Perhaps this explanation (which rests on the expression in the next verse, *pignus oris*) is preferable to that of Chamillard, the Delphin editor of Prudentius, who refers it to a custom of the ancients of veiling their faces with the *orarium* when at prayer, of which, however probable, he does not quote any example. The writer of the French *Vie des Saints*, which I have used in the introductory remarks, takes it as a symbol of purity, no doubt having in mind the *textilis candor*, rendered "white woof," in the next stanza.

‡ *Vasconum gentilitas*. The Vascones occupied a territory corresponding to parts of Aragon, Navarre, and Old Castile. Their name survives in the modern appellation of *Basques*.

A Hymn of Prudentius.

And quits the marrow in which he did lurk,
Leaving his rescued prey all safe and well,
No trace, from head to foot, of his foul work,
But owns himself to burn in fires of hell.

Why talk of bodies healed from long disease,
Of swollen features unto form renewed?
Of some restored whom ague-chill did freeze—
Pale cheeks again with hues of health imbued?

This blessing on us did our Lord bestow,
When to these martyrs sepulture He gave
In this our town, beside bright Ebro's flow—
From many an ill can they their people save.

Sing now, ye mothers, for your children's sake,
A hymn of praise : let the procession stand.
Matrons, thanksgiving for your husbands make—
Be this a day of joy throughout the land.

R. O.

The Yorkshire Branch of the Popish Plot.

IT is, perhaps, not too much to take it for granted that the knowledge of the existence of a Yorkshire branch of the great Popish plot in the time of Charles the Second is confined to few of our readers. Lingard's account of it does not extend beyond a page and a half, and it seems to be passed over in silence for the most part by other historians. It is true the records of this pretended conspiracy are to be found in the State Trials and sundry tracts published at the time, but few persons can be supposed to have had sufficient courage or interest in the subject to draw upon these somewhat repulsive sources of information. And yet there is much in the details of this transaction, and in the characters of the persons involved, that repays any little attention bestowed on the various stages of the conspiracy. For a conspiracy it was, not of the Catholics to kill the King, as was pretended by the informers, but a conspiracy of the informers, from motives of personal spite and revenge, to take away the lives of several innocent and distinguished Catholics. The sole possibility of the success of such a scheme lay in the temper of the English mind, and the rooted, unreasoning conviction, produced by a century of persecution and false accusation, that nothing was too bad for Catholics to attempt. And the fact that the conspiracy was so nearly crowned with success—nay, in one case it did result in a judicial murder—affords a fair sample of the spirit of the times; indeed the whole circumstances of the case are of a kind to throw much light on the parent plot in London, that had just purpled the scaffolds with so much innocent blood, and cast an ineffaceable stain on the reputation of the English people for justice and common sense. It is proposed in the present paper to lay before our readers the details, some of which have not hitherto been brought to light, connected with the Yorkshire plot. To draw attention to these details may not be without utility in the present times, when, incredible as it might seem, there are no faint indications of the

revival of that old savage policy of brute force in dealing with Catholics which it has hitherto been the fashion of English Liberals to regard as one of the most grievous blots of English statecraft. But English Liberalism is, it is hoped in some quarters, destined to change its tactics, and under the superfine manipulation of the *Pall Mall Gazette* and other kindred sources of infallible illumination, to be gradually led to abandon old traditions, and forswear the principles that have hitherto guided the counsels and action of those whom England looks up to as her true patterns of enlightened statesmanship, and to substitute instead the scientific toleration of Professor Huxley, the broad and tranquil historical wisdom of Mr. Froude, and the tender mercies of Prince Bismarck and his attendant dragoons.

Mr. Peacock has recently shown how numerous the Catholics were in the early part of the seventeenth century. His *List of the Roman Catholics in the County of York in 1604*, transcribed from the original MS. in the Bodleian Library, affords sufficient evidence of this fact, and of the harassing and inquisitorial nature of the proceedings of the Government officials in the work of persecution. As Mr. Peacock remarks in his Preface, this list, "although it does not include the whole of the places within the county of York, almost all the old historical families of the shire are represented therein." We meet with names whose unstained honour is still upheld by the descendants of those who then worthily bore them—descendants who still retain with unswerving fidelity the faith for which their fathers were ready to suffer the loss of goods and personal liberty, and, if necessary, to lay down their lives. Such are the names of Scrope, Stapleton, Constable, Lawson, Middleton, Cholmley, Errington, Wright, Meynell, Dolman, Langdale, Vavasour, Tempest, Waterton, and the Trappes of Nidd Hall, since settled in Lancashire. Other names there are of honourable races now extinct, such as Sherborne, Hunngate of Saxton, Thimbleby of Irnham, Conyers, Norton, Thwinge or Thweng, Clitherow, Danby, Rokeby, Wycliffe, Tankard, Claxton, Bathorpe, Purdrey, Tunstall, and Plumpton. The last of the Plumptons died in 1749 at Cambrai. He had conformed to Protestantism, but through the influence of his aunt Ann, a Benedictine nun at that place, returned to the faith of his ancestors before his death.* Another class of names is also found in the list, but the lustre of the faith unhappily no

* P. 31.

longer adorns them. Amongst these are the names of Savile, Wentworth of Woolley, Beaumont, Gascoigne—the descendants of the Chief Justice—Ingleby, Slingsby, Fairfax, Fawkes, Bainbridge—a family to which Cardinal Bainbridge belonged, Pulleyn, Swale, Grimston, and Palmes of Naburn. Of the last named family we are told that its then head, Sir George Palmes, Knight, had been called by way of citation, along with the lady Catharine his wife, into the Consistory Court at York to prove their marriage, “vehemently suspected to have been married by some Popish priest, but how it is not known, and they are presented to have been secretly married.”*

But the list is not confined to persons in the higher ranks of life. We find that “poor farm labourers, servant maids, tailors, and fishermen” were, as much as their social superiors, the objects of strict scrutiny.† Neither age nor sex afforded any protection. Thus Elizabeth Righton, wife to Thomas Righton, of the age of eighty years, is presented in the parish of Kirby Wharfe. “She cometh not to church, but, being frantic, sayeth she will not receive the communion.”‡ Again, we are told with reference to Margaret Clitherow, the martyr of York, “whose prolonged tortures and death in York Castle, endured solely for preserving the lives of others,” as Mr. Peacock justly says, “is among the most harrowing incidents in the long tragedy of Tudor persecution,” that after her execution her husband was forced into banishment. “Her little children, who wept and lamented for their mother, were taken up, and being questioned concerning the articles of their religion, and answering as they had been taught by her, were severely whipped, and the eldest, who was but twelve years old, was cast into prison.§ The widows especially seem to have had hard times. Thus “Agnes Rawson of Sherburne, a dangerous recusant, as is presented upon report, hath had Seminaries or Jesuits divers times resorting to her house, and that some of her servants have confessed that they found divers things in her barn, as cope, chalice, books, and suchlike things as they use for mass, but the names of the priests they know not.|| No one escaped the lynxeyed officials. Thus “one John, a tailor, whose surname they cannot learn, but commonly is called John of no parish, which hath resorted to the house of the said Agnes Rawson these seven years or more, and is thought to be a dangerous fellow, and a common messenger from one recusant to another, and never came to

* P. 141.

† Ref. vii.

‡ P. 22.

§ P. 61.

|| P. 23.

the church."* Secret baptisms and secret marriages were ferreted out—in short, no detail in the domestic life of a Catholic household was safe from the prying eyes of savage intolerance. Priests, it is needless to say, were hunted to the death, and yet nothing checked their untiring zeal, or was too much for their courage to attempt. Thus we have the touching episode of the marriage of William Simpson and Elizabeth Gibson by a priest in York Castle. As Mr. Peacock remarks, "here is a curious picture of the working of the old penal laws. These poor people had been in York Castle, most likely for some offence connected with the practice of their religion, and there, even in the jaws of the grave, as it were, had found a minister of God to join them in holy matrimony. Probably the celebrant was some missionary from beyond sea who had fallen into the clutches of the civil power, and had long before these pages were written received the martyr's crown. If it were not so, and a priest from the outer world had visited them in their confinement for the purpose of exercising his sacred functions, he did so at a risk which required little less courage and far more wariness and circumspection than martyrdom itself."†

The name of Bickerdike occurs in the presentations of the parish of Farneham. To this family probably belonged Robert Bickerdike, "who is said to have been born at Low Hall in Yorkshire," and who suffered death, as in cases of treason, at York in 1616 or the following year. His only crime is stated to have been his "being reconciled to the Church of Rome, and refusing to go to church."‡

It is pleasant to meet with humbler names still borne with honour by the descendants of the stout old recusants of those stormy times. For instance, in the parish of Mytton we meet with the names of Lund and Loud, Dewhirst, Holden, and Wynclyffe or Winckley, names which still flourish amongst the brave Catholic yeomanry and peasantry, that have held fast to their faith in storm and sunshine from generation to generation through three long centuries on the wild Lancashire fells.

As the seventeenth century advanced, no relaxation of official vigilance seems to have taken place, for we have a long list of Yorkshire recusants indicted at the assizes for not coming to church, March 25, 1664. This list was prepared by the village constables and forwarded to York, and contains many

* P. 24.

† P. 107.

‡ P. 50.

of the names that have already come under our notice.* A more extended list was presented in March 1665-6. The old names recur with fresh additions, but out of the whole number, we are told, only five or six of the leading gentry made their appearance at the assizes. Another list of persons who had been absent from church for a month or upwards, was sent up July 6, 1669. Most of the persons mentioned were Catholics. Again the same process is repeated, July 8, 1670. We are not told what is the precise effect of these presentments; but it is certain that the measures of the Government against the Catholics increased in severity towards the end of the seventeenth century. In the latter part of the reign of Charles the Second, the statute of *præmunire* was put in force, and many Catholics who refused to take the oath of allegiance were thrown into prison, and subjected to other inconveniences. Thus in July, 1680, Mr. Raine, the editor of the volume of the Surtees Society's publications already referred to, informs us that several persons were in prison in York Castle for refusing the oaths.† Amongst the sufferers were Francis Osbaldeston, Sir John Lawson, Bart., George Meynell, Esq., Francis Tunstall, Esq., Peter Middleton, Esq., Philip Constable, Esq., Mrs. Catharine Witham, and others. Again, March 10, 1684-5, we have a list of twenty seven prisoners in Ouse Bridge, a prison that was no doubt considered to have the special advantage, as a receptacle for delicate and high born ladies, of being partially under water when the Ouse was high. Amongst these prisoners was the Hon. Mary Fairfax, wife of a younger son of Viscount Fairfax, and daughter of Colonel Hungate, a gallant Royalist, who fell at Chester while fighting for Charles the First. Another lady was "the worshipful Magdalene Metham, wife to George Metham of Metham, Esq., whose father, George Metham, Esq., was wounded, taken prisoner at Willoughby fight; whose grandfather, Sir Jordan Metham, was a great agent in setting up the King's standert in Yorkshire; whose wife and children were sequestered; whose uncle, Sir Thomas Metham, was slain at Hessay Moor; by which this prisoner and her husband are great sufferers." The Methams were one of the most illustrious families in Yorkshire. The honoured Catharine Lassells is found there too. She was "widow to Edward Lassells, a lieutenant in His late Majesty's service, whose father,

* Surtees Society, vol. xl. Depositions, &c., from York Castle, p. 119.

† P. 269.

George Thwing, Esq., rais'd a troop of horse; whose brother, Alphonso Thweng, levied a company of foot for His late Majesty's service; for which their estates were sequestered, and this prisoner at ten years old was imprisoned by young Hotham for being the daughter and sister of such Royalists; and has suffered other ways." And this was the reward of loyalty! There too is "Ancketillus Bulmer, the son of Anthony Bulmer, lieutenant colonel in His late Majesty's service, the which has suffered much." This gentleman was the grandson of Sir Bertram Bulmer, of Tursdale, county Durham, and one of the last representatives of a great and illustrious house. He died in 1718, aged eighty four, Mr. Raine informs us. There too are "Elizabeth Clark, once a servant to the family of Constables;" and George Allen, Richard Snow, and John Dawson, "all common soldiers in His late Majesty's and present Majesty's father's service; sequestered, and now maintain'd in prison by common alms." The Protestant net envelopes all fishes, great and small. The last name we shall mention is that once borne by one of the noblest and most illustrious of Englishmen, that great and true man, Sir Thomas More. "The worshipful Mary and Margaret More, living in this county upon a farm of their mother's, were committ to præmunire (the said Margaret dyed in prison), the daughters of Thomas More, Esq., the grandchildren of Chrizaker More, who was the grandchild of Sir Thomas More, quondam Lord Chancellor of England. The prisoner, in herselfe and family, loyall, and a great sufferer."* Surely there is no true Englishman but whose cheek must flush with shame and indignation at the bare recital of the indignities thus heaped on the descendants of Sir Thomas More. Annoyances and sufferings so nobly borne, like those above enumerated, sufficiently testify to the staunchness of the old Yorkshire race. But higher proofs were not wanting. More than one of the names that have been mentioned were rendered still more illustrious by the martyr's crown. Thus Francis Ingleby, of the Ripley family, suffered at York, June 3, 1586; Anthony Middleton, May 6, 1590; Ralph Grimston, July 15, 1598; Edward Thwing, at Lancaster, July 21, 1600; John Norton and John Talbot, at Durham, August 9, 1600; Thomas Metham, a Jesuit, died in prison at Wisbeach, in 1592; not to mention others.

* It may be well to state on Mr. Raine's authority, that Cresacre More was the great grandson of the Chancellor.

The above brief review of the position of the Yorkshire Catholics during the seventeenth century suggests more than one reflection of a painful character indeed with reference to those who lived and suffered during that doleful period, but full of instruction also and guiding light when viewed with reference to the actual state of the Church, and her principles and mode of action in our own times. A century of harassing persecution, now manifesting itself in the reeking scaffolds, now in the pettiest details of aggravation that a base and malignant tyranny could devise, had plainly been powerless to quench the spirit or deaden the faith of the descendants of those brave men who rallied round the great northern earls in 1569. Nay, it would seem that the number of Catholics in the county had not much diminished since that time when Sadler could assure Elizabeth in writing to Cecil, "that there were not ten gentlemen in Yorkshire that did allow her proceedings in the cause of religion."* And Yorkshire, in 1569, represented the religious condition of the northern counties in general. The different branches of the great house of Stanley still kept their fidelity to the ancient church, and could at any moment have rallied round them on their native heaths a host of gallant men whose names have adorned long lines of descendants that have never swerved from their allegiance to the Catholic faith. In Durham, the dun bull of the Nevilles floated over the battlements of Raby and Brancepeth, as a pledge of the Catholicity of the southern portion of the county, while the great house of Lumley, in its ancient hold on the banks of the Wear, was a sufficient guarantee for the faith of the northern division. The fact that in the county of Durham alone more than three hundred individuals suffered death in 1570 for their share in the northern rebellion, speaks volumes for the faith of the seat of the ancient Palatinate.† From Alnwick the Percy swayed Northumberland, backed by the Swinburnes, the Riddells, the Widdringtons, and many a grand old name besides. The Earl of Cumberland and the Dacres, firm as their native rocks, answered for the prevailing tone of Cumberland and Westmoreland. Even Lincolnshire, the more southern neighbour of the great county, was no exception to the rule, as we find by an address, largely signed by "the knights and gentlemen" of that county, to Philip the Second, professing their inalienable attachment to the Catholic Church, and their desire that Philip should take measures to

* Froude, *History of England*, vol. ix.

† Lingard, vol. vi., p. 207.

help them in their efforts for its preservation.* England, in fact, in 1569, was so far from being Protestantized, that the great bulk of the people still clung in heart and affection to the ancient faith; while that part of the population that had fallen away from the Church was, on the avowal of Cecil himself, in anything but a satisfactory condition. In his "Memorial on the State of the Realm, March 10, 1569," Cecil, that evil genius of the Tudor throne, admits that "the service of God," "and the sincere profession of Christianity, were much decayed;" "and in place of it, partly Papistry, partly Paganism and irreligion had crept in;" "baptists, deriders of religion, epicureans, and atheists everywhere;" "and such decay of obedience in civil policy, as compared with the fearfulness and reverence in times past, would astonish any wise and considerate person." Well may Mr. Froude observe that "it is both instructive and singular to find Cecil, the firmest and bravest advocate of the Reformation, lamenting the decay of reverence and the spiritual disorder which we now see to have been its inevitable fruits."†

Such being the condition of England, and especially of the north of England, towards the close of the sixteenth century, the important question is brought home to us with irresistible force—By what means was Protestantism able to win its way in the face of so many elements capable apparently of being welded into an impregnable bulwark against its advances? And what answer can be given but the answer that has signalized the doom of so many lost causes? Timeserving; that base ingredient that has so often been mixed up with all that is high and noble, tainting all that it comes in contact with, and paralyzing at the critical turning point of fate the bold venture which is the surest augury and infallible pledge of final success. Had the timid and timeserving Norfolk been the man Mary Stuart bade him be, had he, as Mr. Froude admits, boldly "proclaimed himself the champion of the Catholic faith, the Earl of Surrey's son, the premier nobleman of England," he could not have failed to raise a spirit that would have swept all resistance before it, and changed the face of the world. Had Northumberland been true to himself and his own great name, instead of shivering at every sound of alarm, the northern rising would not have been numbered amongst the failures of history. But it was not so to be. The times were evil and out of joint. The breath of mammon had passed over the land; and all had been more or

* Froude, vol. ix., p. 544.

† *Ibid.*, vol. vi., p. 408.

less corrupted by its poison. In a period of change men had lost the habit of loyalty and trust, and so the occasion was missed and passed away for ever. The results were the gibbet at Tyburn, the quartering knife and rack, and the noisome prison house at York, and the possibility of Titus Oates and a Popish plot. A bold front, resolutely maintained at the right time, would have forestalled and barred all these evil fruits of failure; would have been the salvation of the Church then, as it will be the sole salvation of religion and of our rights as Englishmen in the time of fresh trial that may be in store for us. Our safety lies, we repeat it, in the present and in the coming times, in a bold front and unflinching determination to hold our own; not, thank God, in the battlefield, but in the exercise of those rights of free speech, and free and united action that are our birthright as Englishmen—

Una salus victis, nullam sperare salutem.

But it is time to turn to the occurrences which have called forth this somewhat lengthy introduction. The leading spirit in the hatching of the Yorkshire plot was a wretched man of the name of Robert Bolron, the Titus Oates, as he has been called, of the north of England. Mr. Raine has given a clear account of him in his Notes on the Depositions from York Castle, for which he tells us he is principally indebted to a pamphlet intituled, "*An abstract of the accusation of Robert Bolron and Lawrence Maybury, servants, against their late master, Sir Thomas Gascoigne, Knight and Baronet of Barnbow, in Yorkshire, for High Treason: with his Trial and acquittal, February 11, 1680. Fit error novissimus pejor priore.*" Printed for C. R., 1680.* According to this account, Bolron was a native of Newcastle-on-Tyne, and in early life was apprenticed to a jeweller in London, in Pye Corner, where the great fire was stayed. He did not remain long with his master, for after a year's service he ran away and enlisted as a soldier, and before long found himself in Tynemouth Castle. From thence he was sent on board the *Rainbow* frigate to fight against the Dutch. It was not long before he deserted from this service, and soon after contrived to get an introduction to Sir Thomas Gascoigne of Barnbow, through a friend of the name of Richard Pepper, one of the retainers of that house. On Pepper's recommendation

* Depositions, &c., p. 240. The pamphlet mentioned is to be found in *State Trials*, vol. vii., p. 974.

Bolron was appointed by Sir Thomas to the office of inspector of his coal mines near Newcastle. He soon proved unfaithful to his employer and was guilty of gross speculation, on the detection of which, he, Bolron, was removed from his situation, though Sir Thomas generously overlooked his dishonesty so far as to stop any further proceedings in law against him. This was done, we are told, on Bolron's "earnest beseeching Sir Thomas to show him mercy," and Sir Thomas in compassion accepted of £12, and two bonds for payment of £48 principal more, and so about April, 1678, let him go quietly and peaceable away; Sir Thomas (like a good Christian) being desirous he might amend and do better in another service. About a year after his dismissal, being still in debt to Sir Thomas and others of the Gascoigne family, namely, Mr. Thomas Gascoigne, Sir Thomas' eldest son, and Lady Tempest, one of the baronet's eldest daughters; and besides being in arrear of rent for one of Sir Thomas' farms, into which he had got by means of his wife, formerly a servant in the Gascoigne family, he seems to have become desperate under Sir Thomas' threats to take more stringent measures with him. The peculiar complexion of the times suggested a means not only of extricating himself from his difficulties, but of revenging himself upon those at whose hands he had received nothing but kindness and indulgence. The country was suffering from one of those fits of temporary insanity that indicate something like the existence of constitutional disease in John Bull's system. The Popish plot was in full swing, and Titus Oates at the summit of his vile career. In the train of this base and perjured bully and murderer, the great English people, hounded on in the pulpits by men like Sancroft, Burnet, and Tillotson, were dancing like maniacs, bereft of decency, sense, and manhood, to the infinite amusement, not unmingled with disgust and awe, of the nations that were looking on the spectacle. If Titus Oates could be believed, and deal with men's lives and fortunes as he pleased, why should not Robert Bolron have some success in the same great career? The inspiration was speedily acted upon.

Bolron's first step was to qualify himself for the new career he was meditating by declaring himself a Protestant and taking the oaths at Pontefract sessions. He then proceeded to concoct his plot. Sufficient materials were furnished for a colourable foundation for his narrative by certain movements that had recently taken place amongst the Yorkshire Catholics to evade one of the most savage of the State regulations that weighed

them down. The hindrances to Catholic education were well nigh insurmountable. The heaviest penalties fell upon all who sought to obtain this blessing by sending their children to foreign colleges. Attempts to meet the difficulty at home were confined to the few families whose position and circumstances enabled them to keep a Catholic tutor resident in their households. That a certain number of Catholics thus followed the honourable profession of schoolmaster, a profession doubly honourable when the perils of the times are taken into account, appears from some of the presentments to which reference has been made. Thus in the list of recusants, in 1694, George Egleseme, a Scottishe man, a scolemaster, which teacheth the children of Sir Thomas Reresby, is presented at Triburgh. This gentleman was George Eglisbam, M.D., educated at Louvain, who led for several years the life of a wandering scholar. But this expedient fell far short of the educational wants of Catholics, and about the year 1677 a movement was set on foot amongst the Catholics of the north of England to supply some more adequate and efficient remedy. In order to do this, it was proposed to found a convent somewhere in Yorkshire, and Sir Thomas Gascoigne took a lively interest in the scheme. This, no doubt, led to meetings of Catholics in his house for the advancement of the foundation, and these meetings afforded Bolron an eligible pretext and ground for his charges. Having posted himself well up in the various proclamations that had been issued since Oates appeared on the scene, Bolron proceeded to lay informations before several of the Yorkshire justices against Sir Thomas Gascoigne and others. But Bolron's first essay amongst the Yorkshire gentry was not very successful, for being new at his trade, his informations seem to have been somewhat bungled. The magistrates refused to act upon them further than to forward them to London, whither they were followed by Bolron when he found that the Yorkshire justices put too little faith in his depositions to make them the ground of an issue of warrants against the accused.

On reaching London, Bolron was brought into communication with Sir Robert Clayton, and was by him brought before the Privy Council, with the infamous Shaftesbury at its head, on July 4, 1679, when he was examined on oath, and repeated his accusations against Sir Thomas and the others in the form, more or less, that the charge took on Sir Thomas' trial. Bolron alleged that on May 30, 1679, while he was at Sir Thomas'

house, he was asked by Sir Thomas to join a priest of the name of Rushton, the chaplain to the family, in an adjoining gallery, and that Rushton, though highly displeased with Bolron for taking the oath of allegiance, yet proceeded in express terms to ask him to undertake to kill the King; and on Bolron's refusal, Rushton begged him to keep the proposal secret. The proposal was subsequently repeated at six o'clock the same evening by Sir Thomas, who offered to give him £1,000 to kill the King, and if he would undertake to do so, to send him to his son, Mr. Thomas Gascoigne, then in London, who would give him instructions how to proceed, and hand over the reward when the deed was accomplished. The introduction of Mr. Thomas Gascoigne, Sir Thomas' eldest son, was somewhat unfortunate for Bolron, for it was subsequently proved that Mr. Gascoigne, having obtained leave to travel, had left London for Dover on April 7, and was actually in Paris when, according to Bolron's statements, he ought to have been in London in active complicity with the plot. After Sir Thomas' apprehension, which took place at Barnbow, on July 7, by Bolron and a messenger sent as his companion by the Privy Council, Bolron amended his former deposition with reference to Mr. Thomas Gascoigne, by a slight change in the words in which Sir Thomas' offer was made to him, to the effect that Sir Thomas had said that he would send him to his son, if he were in town, and to the rest of them that were concerned for instructions.

This second form being sworn to, it became necessary to seek for some corroborative testimony. In Bolron's first deposition before the Council, he had made some statement with reference to Sir Thomas Gascoigne's servants, and had mentioned one amongst them of the name of Maybury, or Mowbray, as having been sent away in consequence of some suspicion resting upon him of having been concerned in the loss of a trunk of Lady Tempest's, containing money and jewels. Notwithstanding this unlucky introduction of his name, it was on Laurence Mowbray—who had been brought up as a boy in Sir Thomas' household—that Bolron pitched as his second witness, naturally concluding that Mowbray would not be sorry to revenge himself upon Lady Tempest, and secure any good things that might be going to the advantage of plot hatchers at the same time. These expectations were not futile, and Mowbray was soon won over by his fellow villain. Mr. Raine mentions a folio pamphlet containing many particulars about Mowbray, the title of which is, "*The*

Narrative of Laurence Mowbray of Leeds, in the county of York, Gent., containing the bloody Popish conspiracy against the life of His sacred Majesty, the Government, and the Protestant religion, &c. &c. London, 1680." We have his evidence also in the State Trials, in the cases of those who were charged with being accomplices in the plot, as well as his deposition at York, October 27, 1679, in the case of Mr. Robert Dolman, one of the accused. The sum and substance of the charge as sworn to by these perjured scoundrels was, that those concerned in the plot encouraged and contributed to a subscription for setting up the Catholic religion, and for the establishment and endowment of a nunnery at Dolbank near Ripley, and that they had assisted at meetings at which the propriety of killing the King was gravely discussed, Bolron himself having been solicited to carry it into effect. Besides Sir Thomas, his son Mr. Gascoigne, and Lady Tempest his daughter, many other Catholics were involved in the accusations of Bolron and Mowbray, most of whom stood their trial and were acquitted. Among the accused were Sir Walter Vavasour, Mr. John Middleton of Stockhill Hall, Mr. C. Ingleby, subsequently a judge in the time of James the Second, Sir Francis Hungate, Mr. Dolman, Mr. Riddell of Fenham, Sir Thomas Haggerston, Sir Miles Stapleton, Mr. Rushton, Dr. Peter Vavasour, Mrs. Pressick, and Father Thweng. It is pleasant to record these names as belonging to good men and true, who not only professed, but suffered for their faith in those evil times. Most of these, as has been said, were tried and acquitted. Even Mr. Thomas Gascoigne did not escape. He was tried in York in March, 1681-2, together with Mr. Stephen Tempest and Mr. York; the trial ended in acquittal. Father Thweng, a nephew of Sir Thomas Gascoigne's, was the only one whose life was taken away by judicial murder.

The Yorkshire plot has a literature of its own. Several pamphlets were published in connection with it, two of which have already been mentioned. There was besides "*The Papists' bloody Oath of Secrecy*, and Litany of Intercession for England: with the manner of taking the Oath upon their entering into any grand conspiracy against Protestants, as it is was taken in the chapel belonging to Barnbow Hall, the residence of Sir Thomas Gascoigne, from William Rushton, a Popish priest. 1680." This pamphlet is given at length in Cobbett's *State Trials*, vol. vii., col. 969. Another was, "*The Deposition and further Discovery of the late horrid Plot*, by one Mr. C——, late servant

to Sir T—— G——, in Yorkshire. London." S.A. Some of Bolron and Mowbray's statements have their amusing side; amusing that is, as affording some indication of the Protestant capacity to swallow any absurdity, however great, that might be attributed to Catholics. The whole of *The Oath of Secrecy* is an example of this. The working of the confessional is represented in a fashion that could not fail to recommend it to the vulgar taste. After many deep instructions on sundry cases in casuistry, Bolron tells us that "then followed the benefit of absolution, for this or any other service done for the good of the Romish religion." His penance is a more serious matter. He was enjoined on one occasion by Father Rushton to lash himself with a cat of nine tails for having too faintly denied that Father Rushton was a Popish priest. In the month of February he had an indulgence of thirty thousand years given him by the said Rushton, for his encouragement in his zealous proceedings against His Majesty and Government. As a penance it was enjoined him to say daily the Litany of Intercession for England; but if he said it twice a day, then each day he would deliver a soul from Purgatory. Nay, he had heard his ghostly Father say that some Catholics had their indulgences for fifty thousand years, others a plenary indulgence to encourage them to be firmer to this design. In his evidence in Sir Thomas Gascoigne's trial, Bolron couches his principal charge in the following terms—"In 1677, several gentlemen did meet and assemble together at Barnbow Hall, in the county of York, Sir Thomas Gascoigne's house; and their resolution was this, that they would build a nunnery at Dolebank, in case that their plot and design of killing the King should take effect, and the Roman Catholic religion be established in England; upon which account the company there present did resolve they would lose their live and estates to further it, and Sir Thomas Gascoigne did conclude he would give £90 a year for ever for the maintenance of this nunnery; upon which they all agreed that after his death he should be canonized a saint." But enough has been said to enable our Catholic readers to appreciate the nature of the informer's pretended revelations.

Sir Thomas Gascoigne's trial took place in the Court of King's Bench, where he was allowed to have a jury of Yorkshire gentlemen. He was first brought to the bar and arraigned on January 24, 1680. The judges were the notorious Scroggs, Chief Justice, and Justices Dolben, Jones, and Pemberton.

Their conduct during the trial amply bears out Hallam's strictures on the bench at this period—

Never were our tribunals so disgraced by the brutal manners and iniquitous partiality of the bench, as in the latter years of this reign. The State Trials, none of which appear to have been published by the prisoners' friends, bear abundant testimony to the turpitude of the judges. They explained away and softened the palpable contradictions of the witnesses for the Crown, insulted and threatened those of the accused, checked all cross examination, assumed the truth of the charge throughout the whole of every trial.

Hallam adds that Pemberton "showed a remarkable intemperance in all trials relating to Popery," while Scroggs and Jones had thrown themselves with all violence into the popular cry; and as a proof of this, we have Jones in Sir Thomas Gascoigne's trial thus addressing the jury—

Now, gentleman, you have the King's witness upon his oath; he that testifies against him is only on his word, and he is a Papist too, for that he was asked and did confess himself so. I do not say that a Papist is no witness: a Papist is a witness, and he is a witness in a Papist cause, and for a Papist; but I must tell you there is less credit to be given to a Papist in a cause of this nature, who can easily believe they may have indulgences and pardons enough for saving one from the gallows who is to be canonized for a saint if the plot take effect. He hath only affirmed who is a Papist; the other, who is a Protestant, swears what his evidence is.

It was in the face of men like these, on that dim January day, that Sir Thomas Gascoigne, after a life of fourscore and five years spent in honour and good report, stood up to answer for his life to the vile charges that were brought against him. He was afflicted with deafness, but his granddaughter, Mrs. Ravenscroft, gallantly stood by him. Mrs. Ravenscroft pleaded hard for the postponement of the trial till some necessary witnesses could be brought from France, but a fortnight was all the delay she could obtain. The trial accordingly was resumed on February 11. Sir Thomas, on account of his deafness, was allowed the assistance of a Mr. Hobart, who seems to have stood by his side during the trial. Bolron and Mowbray were of course the principal witnesses. The nature of the charges has been sufficiently explained. It may, however, be added, that Mowbray's evidence contained the further accusation of the intention of burning London and York. Many witnesses were called on Sir Thomas' side, and the best comment on the whole evidence is the unanimous verdict of the truehearted Yorkshiremen who had the honesty and courage to stand by their neighbour and countryman, and to vindicate truth in the face of the prevailing madness. Instead of indulging in further

remarks on the trial itself, we propose to lay before our readers one or two documents connected with the events under consideration, which have been kindly furnished by the Superior of the convent at York, a convent which owes its existence chiefly to the generosity of Sir Thomas Gascoigne and his family; and we venture to think that our decision will not be matter of regret. We have first, "*An Extract from the Manuscript Life of Rev. Mother Justina Gascoigne*. She was second prioress of this our Monastery of our Blessed Lady of Good Hope, founded at Paris in 1652. She died May 17, 1690."

This our dear and venerable Mother Prioress, the very Reverend Mother Justina Gascoigne de Sancta Maria, was born in Yorkshire, in England, of renowned parents. Her father was Thomas Gascoigne of Lasincroft, Baronet, lord also of the two manors of Barnbow and Parlington. And not only highly esteemed for his being of the ancient race of knights and baronets (and descended from Sir William Gascoigne of Yorkshire, Lord Chief Justice of England, whose great wisdom and equity is remarked in the English chronicles), but much more for his signal virtue, piety, and heroic courage in suffering many difficulties and persecutions with great constancy for the Catholic faith. Her mother was Anne Simons, a lady of answerable quality, and much honoured in all that country for her exemplary virtue. She deceased in her abovesaid house of Barnbow.

But before we enter into the particular discourse of this our very Reverend Mother Prioress, we cannot but recount some passages of her father and other relations for the concern our very Reverend Mother had in them, and our obligation, they having been very considerable benefactors to us, either spiritual or temporal, as will be seen in their proper places, and being also things of edification.

Her father, Sir Thomas, not having been brought into the plot of Oates and Bedloe, was soon after, by two of his own servants, who, following their evil examples and forgetting their duties and the many received benefits from their good master, accused him with the chief of his family in the year 1680 to have conspired the death of His Majesty, King Charles the Second of England; and upon their false accusation caused him, being then near the eighty eighth (?) of his age, to be seized upon by soldiers and guards and hurried up to London, a hundred miles from his own house, and put prisoner in the Tower, where he remained four months; after which he was brought to his trial.

And when he came before the judge and all the people, he made upon himself the sign of the holy Cross with such devotion that it astonished all the assembly, saying in a high voice—*In Nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, and then remained standing, bareheaded, eight or nine hours, with a cheerful countenance, amidst all the violence exercised against him; but, in fine, it pleased God, to Whose divine will and providence he had wholly abandoned himself and all his concerns, to cause the judge to see his innocence and set him at liberty, beyond all expectation in that time, which was so perverse against Catholics; and Sir Thomas, being by age become so deaf they could hardly make him hear anything rightly, when his friends came to tell him that he was freed and set at liberty, he, taking one thing for another, thinking he was condemned, answered—"Yes, yes; I did believe it. God forgive them; let us pray for them," so resigned and prepared he was for death. And soon after he quitted the world and went to the English Benedictine Abbey at Lambspring, where his brother, the Very Reverend Father Placidus Gascoigne was then lord abbot, and who had been President

of the English Benedictine Congregation in the year 1652, when we came to Paris. This worthy prelate deceased August 3, 1681.

Sir Thomas Gascoigne continuing to live like a religious man six years, when it pleased God to call him also to Himself, May 12, 1686, and ninety fourth of his age, having survived his brother the lord abbot five years.

Another extract from the archives of the Benedictine province of York runs thus—

He was buried in the nave of the church, before the steps by which you ascend to the high altar, in a vault capable of holding two bodies, in which his elder brother, Sir Thomas Gascoigne, who had come to reside at Lamb-spring, after he had been acquitted by the jury on a charge of high treason in 1680, was afterwards deposited according to his request. A leaden plate bearing the names of both, with the additional words—*Sicut dilexerunt te in vita, ita in morte non sunt separati*, marked the spot where their mortal remains were deposited. Sir Thomas died May 12, 1686, in his ninety fourth year.

Another document gives a brief account of Abbot Placidus—

Placid Gascoigne, brother to the venerable Sir Thomas Gascoigne, Bart., and to Dom Michael Gascoigne, "a painful missionary, who died October 16, 1657, in the north of England, in his return from York homewards." Placid was professed at Dienlwart before he was sixteen years of age. On the discovery that this was opposed to the discipline of the Council of Trent, Sess. xxv., cap. 15, he had to renew his profession. "After completing his studies at Paris, he spent sixteen years in the mission very profitably and advantageously to the Church, in great danger of his life, in a violent persecution." Passing through various offices, he was at length elected to succeed Abbot Reyner, and continued to preside until his death, July 14, 1681, æt. 83, rel. 66, sac. 57, and was buried in his abbey church, where he had given the habit to thirty six brethren.

There are some other brief documents having reference to other members of the family, most of whom embraced the religious life, in which, notwithstanding some discrepancy of dates, as in the above extracts, there is perfect agreement in substance.

A further extract from the *Life of Mother Justina Gascoigne* gives some interesting details in connection with other sufferers from Bolron's plot.

And although [Mother Justina] her father came off so well, as hath been said, yet these persecutions did not end there. For her brother, Sir Thomas, passed through a rigorous trial upon the same account, as also her eldest sister, the Lady Tempest—who had been married to Sir Stephen Tempest, who was then a widow—went through a very severe probation by means of those ungrateful creatures [servants], one of which she saved from death for stealing from her a good sum of money. Yet now he did all that lay in him by his calumny to take away her life. So that she was also brought from her father's house to London to appear before the King's Council, where she was sent back to be imprisoned in York Castle and have her trial in that city, where, if found guilty, she should be burned alive.

The apprehension of which was a very martyrdom to this good lady, who was in her nature so fearful that the very thought of death was enough to

make her die, especially such a kind of death, which put all her friends into great anguish and concern, believing she would not be able to appear at her trial; and if she did not she would be condemned as guilty: besides, the greatest families in Yorkshire would have been put to death who were brought in as complices with the Gascoignes. But Almighty God, although He is pleased to permit His faithful servants to suffer something for their merits, yet He never fails to assist and help them when He sees it is the best time, as He did this good lady, now in the greatest necessity, by means of the Reverend Father Maurus Corker, one of our holy order, whom she met with in London, and after some discourse with him she was so strengthened and encouraged that she did not only come to her trial with an undaunted courage and alacrity which astonished all that knew her, but said several times since that she thought she could not only willingly have suffered that burning, but ten times more for God, if He had so ordained, Who was pleased to be satisfied with this her good will and desire to die for His sake; and as to the rest, He delivered her both from the torment and the aspersion cast upon her by right of law and justice, to the great consolation of all the Catholics.

Thus all being happily concluded, and she having no charge of children, desiring to end the rest of her days in retirement, came over to her sister, this our venerable Mother Prioress, and humbly asked the scholar's habit to make a trial in our monastery, which being granted her, she remained in it according to our Constitutions six months, with true content and satisfaction of soul, being fully resolved to live and die with us. For that intention she went into England to sell her jointure, and then to return again; but as soon as she had sold it, God Almighty was pleased to call her to Himself, to crown in the other life this good desire, with the rest of her meritorious works, as we may well hope, the 20th of September, 1684.

There is no record of Lady Tempest's trial, but it is certain that it immediately preceded that of Father Thweng, which took place at York, July 29, 1680. For we find that while the jury was being challenged, Father Thweng expressed his willingness to stand by the other jury, whereupon Mr. Justice Dolben asked him, "What jury?" "My Lady Tempest's jury," he replied. "Oh, your servant," rejoined the Judge, "you are either very foolish, or take me to be so." To give a priest such a chance of acquittal was not to be thought of for a moment.

Father Thomas Thweng, the only victim of this pretended plot whose life was sacrificed, belonged to the family of the Thwengs of Heworth, near York, an ancient Catholic race. He was a nephew of Sir Thomas Gascoigne, and was indicted at York, together with Mary, wife of Thomas Pressick, for high treason. On February 20, 1679-80, Richard Pepper, Bolron's old friend, who had been the means of his introduction to the Gascoigne family, was sent to Newgate for endeavouring to corrupt the King's witnesses against Father Thweng and Mrs. Pressick, who were then in gaol. Bolron thus got rid of a person who might have proved very inconvenient, not to say dangerous to him. The trial began at York in the following

March, but the accused exercised the right of challenge so freely that the postponement of the trial became necessary. It was resumed, as we have seen, in July, and the result was the acquittal of Mrs. Pressick and the condemnation of Father Thweng. Nothing could be more iniquitous than such an issue. The same stock evidence was brought against the accused as had failed to convict the other persons involved in the same charge. And not only that, but Father Thweng urged that his name was not mentioned in the first depositions made by Bolron and Mowbray, a difficulty from which these worthy gentlemen were relieved by the considerate suggestion of Mr. Justice Dolben, that they were doubtless so oppressed by the sense of the magnitude of the revelations they had to make, that it was not to be wondered at if some names should have been at first passed over. Mr. Justice Dolben particularly distinguished himself on the occasion of this trial, browbeating the accused and bullying his witnesses to the top of his bent, and showing an evident bias against Father Thweng in his charge to the jury. Witnesses, servants belonging to the establishment at Barnbow, were brought to show that Father Thweng had not been at that place in 1677, and was never there in any year more than twice; others gave evidence to show from his own avowal, Bolron's vindictive feelings against the Gascoigne family. All was in vain, for as Mr. Justice Dolben said, there was a conviction that the accused was a priest of the Romish Church, and that fact was sufficient to give strength to any evidence, however weak, that bore against the prisoner; to invalidate any testimony, however strong, that could be brought in his favour. In vain did he plead the inconsistency of his being convicted by precisely the same evidence that had failed to lead to the conviction of the others accused of complicity in the plot. "It is very hard that I should be guilty, and none of the rest, who were arraigned for the same crimes." "No," replied Mr. Justice Dolben, "it is not impossible, it is possible you may be guilty and the rest innocent." Where the possibility of this lay, the just and upright judge did not condescend to point out. The verdict was given, and the foul and disgusting sentence passed, the form of which is too well known to require repetition. The sole tranquil and dignified answer of the murdered victim was—*Innocens ego sum*.

So patent and crying was the injustice of the verdict, that efforts were made to save Father Thweng, and he was respited

on August 4. But political feeling ran too high to admit of these efforts being of any avail. Parliament was on the point of meeting, and expediency carried the day. On October 23, the blood of one more innocent man was crying to heaven, not we will trust for vengeance, but for mercy on a misguided land. The martyr's remains were interred in St. Mary's, Castlegate, York, where no doubt they still repose.

It is unnecessary to linger over the trial of Sir Miles Stapleton in 1681. Bolron and Mowbray were, as usual, the witnesses, and to them another worthy was added on this occasion of the name of Smith, otherwise called "Narrative Smith," from the pamphlet that he published. Sir Miles, who was evidently a man of great ability, defended himself stoutly, and brought many witnesses to throw discredit on the evidence of the informers. The chief of these witnesses were his neighbours, Sir Thomas and Lady Yarbrough. The result was a triumphant acquittal.

The end of the wretched instruments of this long series of persecutions, that brought so much discomfort and misery on so many families, is involved in obscurity. Bolron, the leading spirit, seems to have been a man of boundless impudence and audacity. He spoke boldly before the judges, and never faltered on the exposure of his inconsistencies. By dint of a strong character, he brought his wife and mother to join him, though with great reluctance, in his villainous schemes. For a short time he was actually intrusted with a general search warrant from the Privy Council. The following curious document, taken from the *Harleian Miscellany*, will give some notion of his proceedings in virtue of the authority thus granted to him—

I being sent down by an order of Council, bearing date the 17th day of October, 1679, to search several Papists' houses in Yorkshire, Lancashire, bishoprick of Durham and Northumberland; among other houses, searching the mansion house of Richard Sherborn of Stonyhurst, in the county of Lancashire, Esq., in the chamber of Edward Cottam, a Jesuit, or Popish priest, I found the paper hereunto annexed.

This same Cottam, upon the death of Henry Long, mentioned in the said paper, was by the said Mr. Sherborn entertained as his domestic priest, in the stead and place of the other, who, as the Papists gave out, drowned himself, but was rather made away by the Romish party, as being one that was discontented in his mind, and of whom they had a suspicion that he would discover this damnable Popish plot carried on by the Papists; who therefore, as I have heard from several understanding Papists engaged in the plot, procured his death.

The original copy being in Latin, it was thought convenient to print it in that language.

Celebrare quis astringetur. Postremo, ut evidenter testetur, quòd omnes ad hoc opus pium assentiantur, has constitutiones propriâ manu subsignabant.

"Every one shall be bound to celebrate. Lastly, that it may be evidently testified that all do unanimously assent to this pious work, they did underwrite these constitutions with their own hands."

RICARDUS MOORUS,
PETRUS GIFFARDUS,
HENRICUS LONG,
JACOBUS MARKLAND,
RICARDUS SALLINS,
MARMADUKE DALTON,
ROGERUS ANDERTON,
THURSTON ANDERTON,
EDVARDUS ANDERTON,
RICARDUS BARTON,
EDVARDUS MOLLINEUX,
THOMAS ECCLESTON,

PETRUS GOODENUS,
HENRICUS HOLDEN,
GEORGIUS CATERELL,
JOHANNES MOLLYNS,
JOHANNES HOLDEN,
GULIELMUS GERARD,
EDVARDUS BLACKBURN,
P. WINCLER,
JOHANNES URMESTON,
THOMAS HUGONIS,
GEORGIUS BROWN,
GEORGIUS RICH, ai. d. S. onus.

Quando omnes unanimiter consentiantur his constitutionibus, die 28^o Februarii, 1675, hi designabantur superiores.

"When all had consented to these constitutions, the 28th of February, 1675, these were designed superiors."

Reverendissimus dominus,

RICARDUS MOORUS,
D. JOHANNES HOLDENUS, } Thesaurarii.
D. JOHANNES MOLLYNS, }
D. PETRUS GIFFARDUS, Secretarius.

D. ROGERUS ANDERTON, } Collecta pro six hundredis pro Dei-
bienti—"Collector for six hundreds
in Derbyshire."

D. RICARDUS BARTONIUS, for Layland.

D. THO. HUGONIS, for Amounderness.

D. ED. BLACKBURN, for Loynsdale.

D. PETRUS GOODENUS, } for Blackburn hundreds in Lancashire.
D. HENRICUS LONG, }

Having thus given the reader an account of this paper, how I came by it, and in whose custody I found it, I shall leave it to the consideration of any person of impartial judgment, what should be the design of so many priests and Jesuits to make such orders among themselves? And for what reason those orders must be confirmed by so many manual subscriptions? Certainly the orders of their society needed no such confirmations. This must be then some executive business, for so many priests and Jesuits to meet and cabal in the remote parts of the nation; and there also to appoint treasurers and collectors, not ordinary persons neither, but such as could not be named without the title "most reverend lord," which imports them not the treasurers of alms but of contributions. Now, contributions signify sums; and sums, it cannot be imagined, should be collected in these parts for the Jesuits to build Colleges in England.

It remains then that these collectors were appointed for the collection of considerable sums (the largesses of blind zeal and deluded piety, or the price of indulgences for fifty thousand years, and exemptions from Purgatory) to carry on the great work of their damnable plot, which, it is apparent, was hatching in the year 1675, and long before.

And this, I hope, may in a large measure serve to prove and make good that part of my information already given; wherein I have declared that in the counties of York, Lancaster, Northumberland, and Durham, there have been no less than thirty thousand pounds collected by the Jesuits and

priests ; which were, no question, the effects of such orders and constitutions as these above named, for the more speedy bringing to pass the destruction of His most sacred Majesty and the Protestant religion.

As for Long, Dalton, Thurston, Anderton, Tho. Eccleston, and Urmoston, I know them to be all Jesuits ; therefore it is probable to believe the rest are of the same stamp.

ROBERT BOLRON.

London, December 6, 1680.*

What volumes this precious document speaks as regards the receptivity and stupid gullibility of the English official mind in the seventeenth century ! A few words indicative apparently of some fresh arrangement for carrying on the administration of the Church, and raising funds for its support is considered a sufficient peg on which to hang the most monstrous charges. It is a question that admits of only one answer—which is the greatest criminal, the people that blindly lays itself open to be thus practised upon, or the knave who makes capital out of the voluntary insanity of the people ? Happily, the reign of the two miscreants, Bolron and Mowbray, did not last long. The honest northern juries refused to believe them ; they were openly charged with lying and perjury, and in the end they were allowed to shrink away into the darkness that was their fitting abode.

It will have been remarked that the project for the foundation of a convent in Yorkshire was the ground out of which the more serious charges of Bolron grew. The following extract from the manuscripts of the Micklegate Bar Convent at York, a convent so well known to North of England Catholics, and the lineal descendant and representative of the community that struggled into existence under such stormy auspices, may not therefore be without interest, as furnishing some details connected with the original establishment—

Our holy institute was founded in Bavaria in the seventeenth century by illustrious English exiles for England's welfare. In 1669 the first colony ventured to come to England, in the reign of Charles the Second. They were encouraged by his wife, Catharine of Braganza. Reverend Mother Frances Bedingfield, daughter of Francis Bedingfield, Esq., of Bedingfield in Suffolk, headed the little community. A large majority of the Catholic nobility and gentry lived in those days in the north of England, and Mother Bedingfield was earnestly solicited to found in Yorkshire. The great patron and most munificent benefactor of the rising institute was Sir Thomas Gascoigne of Barnbow Hall, near Leeds. He had two nieces members of the institute, and the Reverend Thomas Thweng, the last priest martyred in England in 1680, was their brother. He suffered death for his sacerdotal dignity, and for warmly concurring in promoting the projected foundation. Our first Sisters settled in Yorkshire, and commenced their work of love at Dole Bank, three miles from Fountains Abbey, in 1677. They rented the

* *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. vii., p. 293.

house, which proved too small. They tried two more places—at Heworth, a mile from York, then a house not far from York Castle, till early in 1680 they came to this spot, where their successors now live. They rented the house till 1686, when the Reverend Mother Bedingfield bought it, and also a house at Hammersmith. She had been engaged from her coming to England in founding the two houses, and then (1686) left Mother Cecily Cornwallis Superior at Hammersmith, and she settled at York, and ranks in our annals as our first Superioress. Persecution was the portion of all who laboured to promote the foundation of this convent. Sir Thomas Gascoigne was tried at King's Bench, but acquitted; his nephew, Father Thweng, was tried and executed at York, at a very short distance from this house. Many of our ancient Sisters were in York Castle. Great fears were entertained for the existence of the house when the additional penal laws were made in the reign of William the Third. No fears, no prospect of suffering, could check the zeal of the heroic sisterhood. The pursuivants often searched the house, but there was generally some warning given of their approach, till, in 1694, open persecution was renewed. The "No Popery" cry became vehement, and the entire destruction of the house was planned, but the community was fortunate in having sincere friends.

We append further contributions confirmatory of the facts connected with the establishment of the convent from the manuscripts of the York community. It is a declaration signed by Sir Thomas Gascoigne, with a few words added in his own handwriting—

I do hereby declare that the donation I made I left and do still leave to the disposal of Mrs. Frances Bedingfield, and that my intention is to have thirty pounds per annum applied to her house of Hammersmith, and the rest, when it shall come all into her hands, to two other houses, which are to be erected where she shall think fit, either in or out of Yorkshire, and that in order to the maintenance of those who shall employ themselves in breeding up of children in piety and learning.

Witness my hand,

THOS. GASCOIGNE.

Then in Sir Thomas' handwriting as follows—

Tetigisti rem acu. 3 Scooles for M^{rs} rather than Scollars.

1st Yor.

2 Hamer :

at or La Chap Ausmotherly, or where you may think more fit.

Si Vales bene et ego quidem Valeo 22 No 82.

My remembrance to all wth you and to Mr Juli

Endorsed in Sir Thomas' hand—

For M^{rs} Bene.

We cannot conclude this notice better than by giving from the same source a letter of the aged baronet to Mrs. Bedingfield, written August 6, 1685—

Good Mad. Benefeld,—

I am much satisfied by a letter lately received from my cosen Ingleby that your cause stands very fair, five witnesses being examined for you, yet Thweng seems so favoured by the Master of the Rolls as to put off

the hearing till Mic. Term under pretence of some witness unexamined by him, so as you have need to make good friends to the judge, or at least join in the Commission to avoid foul play. I wish the cause were set down to be heard before the Lord Chancellor.

I have received both your letters, and have writ to my son and to Jack to give you a declaration of trust, which you may procure my cosen Ingleby to draw you and join in the same if he like. None can be so fit to gather your rent as one of them, because the main deed of purchase I may not part with for many reasons. It containeth many other things, and is very long, and would leave no remains in my heirs for disposition of the thing in case those of your institute cease. I have given a memorandum of mine intention in a short note to Mr. Corker, to satisfy all disputes. And I wish, as in my note, 22 Oct., 82, one school at Yo. or Heworth, one at Hamer., and one at Asmotherly or La Chap. (a place of devotion well frequented), or Leeds populous, if the town were affected.

I am exceedingly glad to hear of Isabel Laton, and that she is living, and hope she may raise you buildings at Heworth as she did at Hamer. Commend me to her.

I am now reading in the Book of Tobias, and wish you the comforts I find there, cap. vii. v. ultimo, and conclude—*Forti animo esto filia mea, Dominus Cæli det tibi gaudium pro tedio quod perpessa es.*

I commend me to your good prayers and of all your company.

Yours ever,

THO. GASCOIGNE.

Endorsed—

This for Mrs. Frances Benefeld,
at York.

At the commencement of this paper it was stated that indications were not wanting of the desire of a certain section of politicians to revert to the old policy of persecution with reference to the Catholic Church—nay, with reference to anything that bears the impress of definite Christianity. This desire is no longer implicit; it is frankly and unblushingly avowed. The Oracle has spoken. *Delenda est Carthago.* A writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* has made a pronouncement in the following trenchant utterance. Speaking of what he is candid enough to regard as Ultramontane policy—and under the appellation of Ultramontaniam he must, to be consistent with himself, class everything in the shape of Christianity, everything that professes to repose on any higher ground than that of the mere probability of its truth—the writer in question thus delivers the final dictates of infallible wisdom—

The policy has produced and is producing its effects. An inarticulate growl is heard in many quarters, which one day will swell into a roar to this effect—"Well, if you must have it you shall have it. If we must either submit to you or cast off a great deal which we have hitherto treated with civility, our choice will not be difficult. Whatever may be true, you and your creed are unquestionably false, and by the heavens above and the earth beneath—nay, by the breeches pocket and all that therein is—we will not only not be bullied by you, but we will consider very seriously how far we are justified in allowing you to bully your dupes." Once in its history the English

nation had occasion to express in an emphatic way its opinion of the Pope and all his works. If it is baited beyond a certain point it will be apt to express the same opinion still more emphatically, and with a wider sweep, and if it does it is to be hoped it will make much cleaner work than it did before.

Yes once, and more than once, as the preceding pages testify, the English people—if an assemblage of greedy adventurers, timeserving statesmen, unworthy churchmen, and halfcrazed fanatics deserve such a name—did express in an emphatic way its opinion of Catholics. That once indeed, and in point of fact, was rather an extended moment, comprising only some two or three hundred years, and charged with injustice and brutalities like those we have been contemplating. But be this as it may, we gladly hand over to the *Pall Mall Gazette* all the glory of that opinion which, by its solidarity with this writer, it has made its own. The writers in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, after indulging in a long course of smooth and insidious innuendos against all that—we will not say Catholics, but—the bulk of Englishmen have hitherto held sacred, now at length are trying their hand at plain speaking. Well, be it so; we too will speak plainly and roundly. Do these writers really suppose that, with the light of history to guide them, Catholics will be guilty of the folly of crouching beneath their fulminations? They are fond of probabilities; we regret, therefore, to be constrained to withdraw one probability from the long catalogue of those slippery principles of action in which they delight—the probability that Catholics will tamely submit to be browbeaten in any practical way by that group of doctrinaires, if such there be, of which the above declaration may be regarded as the manifesto. Let this be held as certain and no probability, that Catholics are under no apprehension from threats like these, and that in the present, as in coming times, they will know how to hold their own, and will rather suffer the loss of all things than surrender their dearest convictions as Christians, or bate one tittle of their rights as Englishmen before the coarse blusterings of anonymous scribes. Thank God, English Catholics have breathed too long the free air of England to fear for the result of any struggle that may ensue. In the meantime it may be permitted to suggest that the *Pall Mall Gazette* would find a sphere better fitted for the exercise of its functions under the shadow of Prussian bayonets and Italian daggers, or in the still more congenial atmosphere of Whitechapel, Billingsgate, or Belfast. In these choice regions it will meet with the requisite

helps for perfecting itself in the very gracious character of bully that it has so bravely assumed.

Since the above remarks were written—and we are glad to be able to record the fact—the passage that gave rise to them has met with merited castigation from the better class of organs of the public press. It is true that the passage in question was copied into the columns of certain newspapers that claim to be leaders of public opinion without note or comment, as a rod held up *in terrorem*, no doubt, to refractory Papists; but the *Saturday Review* and the *Spectator* have opened their pages to strong expressions of condemnation with regard to the whole article from which this very liberal manifesto was extracted. The latter journal especially treats the matter with that high toned courtesy for which it has justly earned the respect and gratitude of Catholics, and with that breadth of philosophical view and consistent adhesion to the principles of oldfashioned English liberalism by which it has always been distinguished. When the writers in the *Spectator* find occasion to differ from Catholics, whatever may be said of the consistency of their logic, no charge can ever be levelled against them of want of respect for their own character as Christians and as gentlemen.

These expressions of adverse opinion have elicited an explanation in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. We are sorry to say, although willingly accepting the disclaimer on the part of the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* of any desire to re-erect the gibbet at Tyburn, or reopen the gaols in London and in York, that the answer thus extorted is not of a nature to enable us to withdraw any of the strictures which we have felt called upon to make. It may be, and no doubt is, perfectly true, that the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* had no intention of reviving the spirit that manifested itself in the long period of the savage Tudor and Stuart persecutions, in the Popish plot, and in the Lord George Gordon riots, or even in the mad and ludicrous panic that followed the Durham Letter and the introduction of the existing Catholic hierarchy into England; nay more, that he did not reflect upon the special aptitude of his words and phrases, especially at a time of public excitement, to rouse that old spirit once more. The writer was suffering, no doubt, from a fit of irritation that Irish Bishops and Irish Catholics should venture to have an opinion different from his own, and should have dared to give practical effect to that opinion; or very

probably he was suffering from the evil effects of a surfeit of Mr. Gladstone, and was for once unwittingly betrayed into a strong specimen of the firebrand style. Still, making all possible allowance for human weakness and political dyspepsia, it is a grave question in the interests of social harmony and the public peace—a question that admits of only one answer—whether an influential public journal would be guiltless of any consequences that might have followed from the announcement of, to say the least, very strong opinions, couched in language of so loose a kind, as at first sight to convey no other meaning than the sanction and advocacy, under certain contingencies, of persecution of the Tudor and Stuart type. That any other construction could have been put upon the writer's words when taken in their simple, literal sense and construction is impossible.

But, in truth, there are wider interests at stake than the question of the persecution or non persecution of a Catholic minority. The doctrine of the writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette* amounts to this—that when the opinions of a minority contravene the regulations of the State, nay, as in the case that gave rise to the fulmination under discussion, run counter to the prevailing tone and opinion of the majority, and when such minority take such practical measures as are strictly within the province of legitimate political action to uphold their own convictions, or in the writer's own words—

—choose to make themselves a political party, the diminution of their power by legislating in a manner unfavourable to it upon subjects in which they are interested will become a direct object with the Liberals.

Well, be it so; but if in the meantime Catholics strain every nerve in opposition to such proposed legislation, why are they to be the butt of such fierce anathemas for exercising a right that pertains to them in common with every British subject? For no other reason that we can see, than the determination of a small section of academical Liberals, or Carlylesque dogmatists, or call them what you like, "to impose their own will," not on Catholics alone, but on all who hold with certain conviction anything like Christian truth. For to have recourse to legislation to fetter the free action of Christians in the matter of "marriage, education, and religious endowment," is surely to impose the will of the would be legislators on the objects of such legislation in respect of rights of the most vital nature, rights that rest upon the imprescriptible claims of conscience, if any rights can be said to do so. It is simply idle to say that

such legislation would not be penal when the precedents of past times are invoked to furnish the norm of future enactment. The penal laws are not yet forgotten. The practical question is, whether these are to be renewed. The answer, it would seem, is to be in the affirmative. A new creed is rising in the world. It is this: "that religion is matter of opinion and probability; that whoever claims to know much more about it than other people, and in particular whoever claims to be the exclusive guardian and authorized interpreter of a divine revelation, is condemned, *ipso facto*, and that the fact that he makes such pretensions, disentitles him to any advantages that he may claim from public authority. Upon this broad ground we would deal with questions like that of education." We confess that it is beyond our ability to see how this programme can be carried out without inflicting penalties of a severe kind upon dissentients. Concussion, not freedom, is to be the order of the day.

And, in fact, this is the ultimate upshot of the whole matter. All that is distinctly Christian must be put down; Mr. Gladstone, as being too much of a gentleman and a Christian, must be suppressed; and after that the deluge. Nothing that bars the advent of the great millennial period of probabalism unadulterated, or nihilism pure and simple, must be suffered to cumber the earth. *Force* is great, and it *shall* prevail.

This is the tyrannical spirit without veil or concealment; and it is well that we should face the fact. The glamour of Prussian bayonets has not been cast over the earth for nothing. Here evidently is a school that draws its inspirations from the lights reflected from brazen helmets and flashing swords. That this school will gain a permanent footing in England we cannot believe; but if it does not, it will be in good measure owing to the fact that the Catholic Church will prove herself to be, as she has always been, the home of the true liberties of the human race.

T. B. P.

Why Mr. Gladstone failed.

IF the question of Irish University Education were—as many English newspaper writers, and perhaps not a few English members of Parliament, sincerely desire—fairly dead and buried, in consequence of the failure of the measure introduced by the Government at the beginning of the present Session, it would hardly be worth while to speculate upon the causes of that failure. Historically, indeed, such an event would always have its interest; but if there are to be no more practical efforts made to relieve what all statesmen—as distinguished from irresponsible talkers and the writers of leading articles—allow to be a serious grievance and even a scandal, then it will be of no use to examine what are the elements the combination of which produced the late catastrophe. The belief is loudly expressed—especially by persons who have no wish whatever in the matter except to see Catholics and Irishmen oppressed and excluded from all spheres of power, influence, and prosperity, up to the extreme limit beyond which their exclusion from such spheres becomes an imminent danger to the Empire—that we shall hear no more of Irish University Bills. We by no means share in this belief. English statesmen are obliged to be more wise and more just than “independent Liberals” and the reckless haters of religion who write in the *Times* and its evening satellite. Once in the last quarter of a century an English Minister was unscrupulous enough to raise the whole country by an anti-Catholic fulmination, and he has ever since that time remained a conspicuous monument of that utter failure as a politician which was the just retribution of so great a dereliction of duty. English statesmen sincerely wish to see all the acknowledged grievances of Ireland remedied. They have to govern. They are responsible for the peace, the integrity, the security of the United Kingdom, and for the highest interests of the various classes of the subjects of the Crown. The national and religious prejudices which divide those who ought to be united for the common good, are the

stock in trade on which the parliamentary and journalistic adventurers of the day may speculate, and which they certainly lose no opportunity of turning to the utmost possible mischief. But to men who have to keep an Empire together and to carry on the government of a free State, these prejudices and antipathies appear in their true light as sources of danger, to stir which is high treason against England. We have little doubt that there are but few such men among us—few even of those who have themselves strong anti-Catholic feelings—who could not gladly hail an opportunity for the reconsideration of the question which the writers who trade upon popular prejudices have been so eager to assure us can never again be touched. Nay, as time goes on there is a perceptible change in the tone even of these writers themselves, and the reduction of Mr. Fawcett's Bill—the darling scheme of all haters of religious education—to its present modest dimensions, a reduction which leaves the question of the organization of a real Irish University untouched—is a sign that the attempt to preclude the future revival of the subject by carrying a thoroughly bad scheme through by a sort of *coup de main* has already failed.

We do not believe, therefore, that we have heard the last of attempts to meet the difficulty of Irish University Education. Educational grievances, indeed, as has often been remarked in these pages, are grievances as to which it is not easy to rouse the popular feelings: for the very simple reason that the more men need education the less are they aware of the deficiency. But in the present case the disadvantages which are imposed upon Catholic students are glaring and are acknowledged by all, except by a set of writers who make no scruple of shutting their own eyes, and if possible the eyes of others, to what they do not wish to look at, and of then boldly denying its existence. And indeed, the party to which these particularly candid people belong does not so much question the existence of the want of some remedy, as the reasonableness of the objection felt by all but themselves to their own special nostrum. Everything, moreover, seems to show that if the grievance which now presses on Catholics in the matter of University Education is considerable at the present moment, it is certain to become still more considerable as time goes on. And few, even of the most bigotted, can really suppose that ten years hence the Catholic people of

Ireland will still be tamely tolerating the injustice against which they have so often and so strenuously lifted their voice. The question, therefore, will have to be settled—justly or unjustly, as the case may be, for the time. But it is a question of that kind which no unjust arrangement can really settle. Unless the Irish people obtain justice, the result can be nothing but a state of disaffection and discontent, which will vent itself, by a natural and inevitable law, whenever an opportunity occurs, in a way which may even ruin the integrity or the security of the Empire. Whether the men, on whose shoulders really lies the blame of the late failure, care more for the security of the Empire than for the triumph of their own anti-religious principles, may fairly be questioned. But it is some witness to the importance of religious education, that these enemies of all that is good would rather see England humbled in the dust than allow Catholics to enjoy Catholic education. There must be something very valuable in what such men regard instinctively with so deadly a hatred.

The apparent cause of the defeat of Mr. Gladstone's Bill was the momentary union of the Catholic members with the well disciplined forces of the regular Opposition under the lead of Mr. Disraeli. It went forth to Europe that the Catholics had upset the Government, and Mr. John Lemoine in the *Journal des Debats* moralized on the power of the old man in the Vatican to destroy one of the strongest Ministries that ever ruled in England. Even on the patent facts of the case, however, such conclusions are arbitrary—for the English and Scotch Liberals who deserted their leader in the division were quite as much responsible for the result as the Conservatives or the Irish Catholics. But in order to understand the combination which led to the shipwreck of the Government measure, we must look beyond political parties, and even the religious divisions between one Christian denomination and another. Every measure designed for the benefit of Ireland which is not concerned with simply material interests, must of course be shaped with regard to the two great confessional divisions of which the nation is composed, the Catholic and the Protestant, under which last head we include the Presbyterians as well as the members of the "Church body." For a long series of generations, Ireland has been governed and legislated for on the principle of Protestant domination and Catholic subjection. With the granting of Catholic Emancipation, at the end of the

reign of George the Fourth, a new era began, and no legislation is now undertaken but on the avowed principle of religious and national equality. The first great practical compromise in relation to the subject of education was the introduction of the National system for primary schools. This was the first application of that principle of mixed education about which we hear so much at the present day, and it was acquiesced in by the Catholics, not as what they most desired, but as what might be tolerated without vital injury to religious interests. On the Protestant side, as Archbishop Whately confessed, there was a deliberate intention and hope of ruining the Catholicity of the country by means of the mixed schools and the books of alleged neutral character which were to be used in them. This National System has turned out to be, in its working, less harmful than might have been expected, because there are comparatively few parts of Ireland in which the population is composed of equal proportions of Catholics and Protestants, so that the schools are in a large majority of cases really "denominational" as regards both teachers and scholars. It is certain, however, that at the present time the introduction of such a system would be opposed by Catholics, and this for two reasons, one of which is of great importance in its bearing on the question of University Education. The first of these reasons is that in the National schools, even when all the scholars, as well as the teachers, are Catholics, there is of necessity a great restraint upon the exhibition of external objects of religion as well as on the practice of devotion, a restraint which is felt as a grievance and as a fetter on religious liberty. The second reason is that the question between mixed and "unmixed" education has become more prominent and vital—as the battlefield, for the time, between the Church and modern infidelity. The Church has never changed her principles on the matter, but the practical evils involved in a compromise as to education have been more forced upon her notice, and have been greatly aggravated by the manner in which a small, but active and determined, band of her enemies have endeavoured to develope what may almost be called a new religion out of indifferentism in education, and to force it upon the acceptance of her children as a modern Gospel.

The true turning point in the history of this question is the rejection on the part of the Catholic authorities of the "Queen's University"—commonly known as the "Godless

Colleges." Since the days of Sir Robert Peel, the aversion of Catholics to the mixed system of education has been continually increasing, and this tendency on the part of the Church has been met by a corresponding intensity of determination on the part of those who we must call "Mixed-Educationists" to force this particular system down the throats of all, and to permit of no other. It is impossible rightly to understand the present state of the Educational question, either in England or in Ireland, without taking into account this fact. There are a set of men, writers in newspapers and members of Parliament, who have really no definite creed at all—except that there is no such thing as definite religion in the world. It might be thought that persons who have arrived at this very satisfactory conclusion in their own minds would have been content to give themselves up to that "healthy animalism" and liberty from all restraint, moral or religious, which such a creed necessarily involves, without troubling the convictions of the rest of the world. But it is a curious phenomenon in such people—to be accounted for, perhaps, by some feeble remains, in their not entirely emancipated minds, of the superstitions of conscience and belief in the supernatural—that they consider it a crime in any one else to believe more than themselves. It might have been thought that a spirit of persecution would be one of the most unlikely elements in a temper of this kind; that it could hardly seem worth while to force the consoling doctrine that nothing is true upon other men at the point of the bayonet. Yet so it is—the world has never seen a more intolerant, more arrogant, more bloodthirsty set of persecutors than some of the men who hold these opinions. If they had the opportunity, they certainly would not lack the will to proscribe all religious education, and to compel all who value definite truth, Protestants and Catholics alike, to send their children to mixed schools, in which they would be taught, not either Protestantism or Catholicism, but what is supposed to be common to both, combined with a new article of faith which neither of the two admit, namely, that neither is absolutely true, and, indeed, that there is nothing absolutely true anywhere, and that it is high treason, heresy, or any other form of crime you like, to say so or to think so. It is not the fault of these men that a new Islam is not forced upon the world—"There is no truth but that there is no truth, and the State is the Prophet" commissioned to preach this doctrine and exterminate all who gainsay it.

It is well to look things in the face, and to understand clearly the people with whom we have to deal. Mixed-Educationism, Antidogmatism, Apostatism, or by whatever name the new religion may be called, is a development of the present generation in England and Ireland, and ought to be treated as the creed of a new and aggressive sect, which, if we judge from the utterances of some of its advocates, is ready to assert itself as the authorized religion of the State, and to propagate its doctrines, if possible, by Act of Parliament. There is a wide difference between even the insidious "common Christianity" of Dr. Whately and the fullblown "anti-Christianism" which it is now sought to force upon us. There may be some appearance of harmlessness about the Bible reading books and the like which are issued by the National Board in Ireland for the purpose of primary education, when reading, writing, and arithmetic form the staple of the matter taught in the schools, and religious instruction is otherwise provided for. But as the grade of education rises, and especially when we come to those subjects which are the most important elements in a University course, moral philosophy, metaphysics, history, and the like, it is obvious that an apparently negative or neutral teaching must become not only bewildering or insufficient, but positively dogmatic in a sense hostile to religion. Thus there are now three, and not two, systems of education claiming the suffrages or the patronage of the statesmen who have to legislate for the acknowledged want of Ireland. There are three creeds and three parties; two forms of Christianity, and one form of anti-Christianity, hostile to both of the others. There is a new cross division, besides the old division between Protestant education and Catholic education, and in this new division the two old rivals are ranged side by side against a common enemy. On the question as to denominational or undenominational education, Catholics are on the same side with earnest Protestants, though it is to be feared that many Protestants, whether from hatred of Catholicism or some other motive, are more ready now than of old to accept mixed education, which has a party of its own, as we have said, desirous of establishing it, not as a compromise by which the moral claims of conflicting religions may be reconciled, but as a definite teaching of itself, the tendency of which, as they hope, may be to destroy attachment to all religion, as such, in the minds of those who are subjected to its influence.

Since the establishment of the Godless Colleges, this system, or creed, or party, has been represented in Ireland in the tangible and imposing shape of institutions supported by the State. Like the English ascendancy in Ireland, Mixed-Education has its garrisons and its fortresses in Belfast, in Cork, and in Galway. No one pretends to suppose that the people of Ireland require these institutions. No one imagines that there was any desire for their existence, any movement or craving among the people which would have brought them into existence but for the English Parliament. No one would be bold enough to assert that if the supporting power of the public purse were withdrawn from them, they would be able to support themselves, or maintain even a momentary life. They live solely by artificial means, and, if these means were withdrawn, they would vanish into thin air without leaving a regret behind them, except on the part of the officials who draw salaries for services discharged in them towards equally salaried students. Or if this estimate of the Queen's University seem unfair, and if it be thought, on the other hand, that it has really won for itself some position in the regard of Irishmen, it must at least be confessed that the Irishmen who value that University are mainly those Protestants who look upon it as an institution the tendency of which is practically Protestant in their own sense. In this way the Queen's College at Belfast appears to have attracted some kind of esteem from the Presbyterians of the North, and it was more than once spoken of in the debate on Mr. Gladstone's Bill as a denominational establishment. This is enough to show that the Queen's Colleges have in no sense gathered to themselves a following as places of mixed education. As such, they are mere encumbrances of the soil—only not deserving of the famous epithet of upas-tree, because their influence for evil has not yet become very formidable, for the simple reason that they possess very little influence at all. But as the representative institutions of a new system and a new creed, which it is sought to propagate in Ireland, against the desire of the Irish people, by means of English support and patronage, their influence is not contemptible in the direction of alienating more completely than before, if that were possible, the affection of Irishmen from the English Government. Once condemned by the Church, they can only be supported as institutions intended to counteract her influence, and emancipate, as the phrase runs, the Irish laity from the ascendancy of their priests and bishops. As it happens

that Irish laymen value their religion quite as much as their priests and bishops value it, are aware of the great debt which they owe to their clergy, and have no sort of desire to be emancipated from their influence in all matters where that influence is legitimate, and notably in the matter of education, this distinct aim of the Godless Colleges, their founders and supporters, is felt by Irishmen as an insult, and they consequently look upon these Colleges as so many embodiments of the desire felt on this side of St. George's Channel to degrade and humiliate them.

If we now turn to Mr. Gladstone's late Bill, and endeavour to trace in its provisions the influence of the three parties or systems respectively which present themselves for the statesman's consideration in dealing with the educational wants of Ireland, we shall have no difficulty in seeing how it was that the Bill was certain to encounter the opposition which proved fatal to it. All due allowance must be made for the position of the Ministry who introduced the Bill. They were unfortunately fettered by pledges given by their chief against the granting of any direct endowments whatsoever to a Catholic College or University. The disadvantages under which the Catholics lay were the avowed reason for the measure, and yet the Prime Minister had engaged himself not to put the Catholics on an equality with others in the matter of endowment. And yet, in regard to higher education, endowment is almost the whole battle. Where religion is directly concerned, as in the case of the support of the clergy or even the building and maintaining of churches, experience has shown that the people may be relied upon to furnish the necessary funds, even though they be themselves, in the main, poor. The pence of the poor Irish support many a flourishing mission in England, and have built many a splendid church to the glory of God. But educational establishments are another matter. They require a considerable apparatus in the way of buildings, provision for professors, and the like. The students must be supported; and their condition as students implies that they are unable to work for themselves. In all these respects the Protestants in Ireland were already magnificently provided for at Trinity College, Dublin. They had also open to them the new Queen's Colleges, which must, however, be considered chiefly as furnishing ample means, at the expence of the State, for the sparse adherents of mixed education, as well as for those Protestants whose consciences do not revolt at the new religion of indifferentism. On the other hand, the

Catholics had nothing at all from endowments, nothing at all from the State. They had the Catholic University, the noblest institution in the country, the institution most deserving of sympathy from all lovers of learning and all admirers of self-sacrificing zeal, for this one and sufficient reason—that it was the creation of the people of Ireland, unassisted and unfavoured by the State. The Catholic University was poor and struggling—how could it be otherwise? It had no power to grant degrees, it was an infant institution, it laboured under all the disadvantages, positive and comparative, which its condition and situation necessitated. Such was the position of the three parties—and we may truly call them the three denominations—when Mr. Gladstone undertook to remedy the crying evils of the case. The Protestants of the Disestablished Church had a rich College and University, the degrees of which were recognized everywhere. The Mixed-Educationists had their University and their Colleges, amply endowed, and able to grant degrees. The Catholics, the immense majority of the people of Ireland, had a poor University, unendowed, unchartered, unable to grant degrees.

In cases of disparity of this kind, there are two obvious ways of producing equality. One way is to raise the unendowed College or University to a level with the endowed College or University. The other way is to reduce the latter to the level of the former. The first of these two ways is the obvious way—because Colleges and Universities require substantial means for their existence, and cannot flourish without them. They belong to that class of institutions which must be liberally assisted in some way or other, if it is to be really of service to the public good. No enlightened Christian State will ever refuse abundant provision for establishments on which the civilization and culture of the body politic mainly depend. The obvious way, therefore, of meeting the difficulty would have been to lump the existing endowments, and then divide them among the Colleges of all denominations, founding such Colleges, *ab initio*, if they were necessary. The principle of this application of endowments has long been settled in this country, nor, indeed, has any objection to such a course as that here mentioned been urged on the score of principle. This, we repeat, was the natural way to put the various claimants for University education on the footing at once of relative equality and of competent provision. There was nothing to prevent this

way being adopted by Mr. Gladstone, except his former pledges, and a supposed impossibility of carrying any measure of what is called "concurrent endowment." Of all the nonsensical phrases which have for a time enslaved the minds of men in our generation, this phrase is the most nonsensical and the most false, except only that of "Papal Aggression." People dream of concurrent endowment as the Anglican Bishops at the time of the establishment of the Hierarchy dreamt of Cardinal Wiseman issuing from the Flaminian Gate at the head of an army of Inquisitors, from whose terrible tortures they could only escape by hiding under the skirts of Queen Victoria's robes of state. "Concurrent endowment," the present bugbear of Cabinet Ministers, means nothing more or less than the endowment of several Colleges or Universities at once. Unfortunately, "concurrent endowment" is an impossibility, because every College and every University in Ireland is already amply endowed—partly at the expence of the Irish people—except only the College or University for which they desire endowment.

But, supposing this way to be out of the question, one other alternative remained, by means of which equality, at least, would have been secured. This means would have been the disendowment of the Protestant and Godless Colleges, and the absorption of their entire revenues for some perfectly neutral purpose. In this case, Trinity College, Dublin, the place of higher education for the Disestablished Church, would have been thrown for support, as far as endowments are concerned, upon the zeal of the members of that body, exactly as the Catholic University is dependent for support on the zeal of Catholics. The Queen's Colleges would have become dependent on the zeal of the votaries of Mixed or Secular or anti-Christian education, or upon that of those Protestants whose religious tenets permit them to frequent such establishments. It would have been difficult, even under such arrangements, to say that a condition of perfect equality had been attained, because both Trinity College and the Queen's Colleges would have been largely supplied with buildings and other necessary apparatus for the discharge of their functions, either at the cost of the State or by means of former endowments. Neither of these things would be true of the Catholic College. Still, the withdrawal of public money from the Godless Colleges and the application to other purposes than the support of Trinity College of the great bulk of the property of that

College, would have to a certain extent reduced the condition of these establishments to an equality with that of the Catholic University, and the statesman who started with the idea that the endowment of that University was a thing not to be thought of, was bound by his own action to bring about such an equality in some way or other. If this idea of the disendowment of the Protestant Colleges looks like confiscation, such a measure is not altogether new in the policy of Mr. Gladstone or to the minds of the men of the present generation. Moreover, as regards the Queen's Colleges at least, it is idle to use such an expression of a measure which would simply prevent an annual charge on the public purse from being any longer made for a purpose useful to very few, offensive to very many, and quite out of harmony with the principle of nonendowment. Mr. Gladstone himself proposed to destroy altogether at least one of these titular seats of learning, and we hope and believe that the time will come when they are either suppressed altogether or changed, as they well might be with advantage to the country, into High Schools for middle-class education, one of which might be handed over to the Protestants of the North, and the others to the Catholics.

It is needless to say that no such equality as that here spoken of would have been provided by Mr. Gladstone's Bill. It was a mistake to encumber the new attempt at legislation by any proposals to deal with the Queen's University, unless such proposals pointed to simple abolition, or to a reduction of the Godless Colleges to the level of schools. As it was, the attempt was made to incorporate them into the new University of Dublin; an attempt which at once threw the fated shadow of Mixed Education over the new creation, and gave its adherents in Ireland—in which country they seem disposed to make up for scantiness of number by noisiness and arrogance—a claim to be heard as to the supposed injustice of forcing them to be in some degree governed by a Board on which Denominationalists would sit as well as Secularists. Unfortunately, however, this was not the only mistake which the Government made in the same direction. The ambitious design of creating a single National University might have been carried out if Mr. Gladstone had had the courage to be perfectly fair, and to put all religions or denominations—under which last head we include the Mixed Educationists—on a real footing of equality. But such a design could never be accomplished on the principle of not granting

to the Catholics what the Protestants and Secularists already possessed. If there were to be no Catholic endowments by the side of the large endowments enjoyed by the Secularists and Protestants, then it would have been but the simplest and most obvious wisdom to provide in some humbler way for the relief of those Catholic disabilities which the imprudent pledges of the Government, or the supposed impossibility of passing any measure, did not preclude them from relieving. In that case, a measure which left Trinity College and the Queen's College in the possession of their exceptional endowments for the benefit of a small minority of the nation, while it conferred a Charter on the Catholic University, recognized its degrees, and founded some purely secular Professorships or Bursarships in it, would have met with at least acquiescence from those whose claims for relief are acknowledged, though they would not have been worthy of the name of men of common sense and citizens of a free country if they had been contented with such boons while others were treated to all the benefits which the resources of the State could lavish upon them. By means of such a measure, the Catholics would have been put in possession of most of the advantages which the admirers of the late Bill declared that it opened to them. It was, in fact, as we shall presently see, the fact that even so much as these were opened to Catholics that in truth ruined the prospects of the measure. The opposition which caused its rejection came from those who could not bear the idea of Catholics winning anything at all, even from an University the principle of which was the Mixed Education principle. But the Government at all events could not have objected to giving the Catholics directly what they were prepared to give them indirectly. Their being able to receive so much indirectly and possibly, was the only answer that the Ministers could make when asked how and in what sense their Bill relieved the hardships under which the Catholics labour. Such relief was the main object of the measure. Why, then, could it not have been offered in a manner which Catholics could accept?

It was not offered in such a manner, because, as we have already hinted, it was offered at the price of the adoption, to a very considerable degree, of the poisonous principle of Mixed-Education. Let it not be said that a National University cannot be conceived, in the case of a nation divided in religious belief, without the adoption of this principle. Catholics, Protestants,

and Secularists might have their own Colleges, and their own teachers on all subjects—not only on subjects which are supposed to involve different treatment at the hands of teachers of different creeds. The Examinations and other arrangements, as well as the allotment of prizes and emoluments for the support of students or of teachers, might be left to the University authorities, and all that the Catholics would require would be that they should have a fair share of places on the Board or in the Senate which ruled in all these respects. We are describing no plan of our own, no plan as to which it can be uncertain that in principle it would have been accepted by Catholic authorities. We say this in all confidence, not from any private sources of information, as to which we are as destitute as the Government themselves seem to have made a point of being—to our minds, unwisely and uncourageously. We are but describing the plan sketched out by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland themselves, in the Resolutions unanimously passed by them in August, 1869, at Maynooth, and published with the signature of his Eminence Cardinal Cullen. We take the liberty of reproducing some of these famous Resolutions, which were received with a howl of obloquy by the Protestant Press at the time, and misrepresented with the same unscrupulous injustice which has marked the language, we are sorry to say, of the same Press on the present occasion as regards the attitude of the Catholic Bishops towards Mr. Gladstone's Bill. As to this injustice, we cannot except even the papers which are usually most fair and cautious in their statement of facts. In 1869, then, the Archbishops and Bishops spoke in the following terms on the question of Higher Education—

V.—As regards higher education, since the Protestants of this country have had a Protestant University for three hundred years, and have it still, the Catholic people of Ireland clearly have a right to a Catholic University.

VI.—But should Her Majesty's Government be unwilling to increase the number of Universities in this country, the Bishops declare that religious equality cannot be realized unless the degrees, endowments, and other privileges enjoyed by their fellowsubjects of a different religion be placed within the reach of Catholics in the fullest sense of equality. The injustice of denying to them a participation in those advantages, except at the cost of principle and conscience, is aggravated by the consideration that whilst they contribute their share to the public funds for the support of educational institutions from which conscience warns them away, they have moreover to tax themselves for the education of their children in their own Colleges and University.

VII.—Should it please Her Majesty's Government, therefore, to remove the many grievances to which Catholics are subjected by existing University arrangements, and to establish one National University in this kingdom for

examining candidates and conferring degrees, the Catholic people of Ireland are entitled in justice to demand that in such University, or annexed to it—

(a) They shall have a distinct College, conducted upon purely Catholic principles, and at the same time fully participating in the privileges enjoyed by other Colleges of whatsoever denomination or character.

(b) That the University honours or emoluments be accessible to Catholics equally with their Protestant fellowsubjects.

(c) That the examinations and all other details of University arrangement be free from every influence hostile to the religious sentiments of Catholics, and that with this view the Catholic element be adequately represented upon the Senate, or other supreme University body, by persons enjoying the confidence of the Catholic Bishops, Priests, and people of Ireland.

VIII.—The Bishops also declare, that the Catholics of Ireland are justly entitled to their due proportion of the public funds hitherto set apart for education in the Royal and other endowed schools.

IX.—The Bishops furthermore declare, that a settlement of the University question to be complete and, at the same time, in accordance with the wishes of the Catholic people of Ireland, must include the rearrangement of the Queen's Colleges on the denominational principle.

If we compare these plain, simple, and dignified demands with the Bill of Mr. Gladstone's Government, we see at once where the difference between the two schemes lies, and what it is that caused the opposition on the part of the Catholics. The main and vital difference lies in the adoption of the principle of Mixed Education in the Government plan. It is true that many sacrifices were made, at least in the plan as it was presented to the House of Commons, in order to meet the legitimate objections of Catholics. There was to be no University teaching in theology, modern history, or in moral or mental philosophy; but the teaching of the University, as such, by means of its Professors, as far as it extended, was to be common, or on the mixed principle. Moreover, these concessions were withdrawn as the discussion on the Bill proceeded. In the speech which closed the debate, Mr. Gladstone himself intimated his willingness to abandon these provisions. That he did so, shows from what quarter the defeat of the Bill proceeded. The pressure to which the Minister had really to yield came from the advocates of Mixed Education; the men who could not bear the idea of abandoning the delightful privilege of that peculiarly hateful tyranny which consists in forcing Catholic students, in the only Universities in Ireland where they can gain degrees and prizes, from listening to the teaching of Protestant or infidel lecturers, or moral and mental philosophy and modern history. But it is to our present purpose to observe, that as far as the new University was to be a teaching body, as distinct from the Colleges, it was to teach on the principle of Mixed Education,

and in this the Government plan diverged, as to a vital point, from the conditions laid down by the Irish prelates in 1869. This original divergence was bad enough; but it is clear that if the Bill had got into Committee, the University which it created would have been as absolutely anti-Catholic as the Godless Colleges themselves. The Catholic principle is perfectly simple, and perfectly intelligible, and it is adopted in practice by all who have any regard for religious principle, whether Protestants or Catholics. It is nothing more than that students should be taught by teachers of their own faith. When Anglicans make this demand, they are called good Churchmen, men of principle, and the like. When Catholics make it, they are accused of aiming at ascendancy, of putting forward arrogant and impossible pretensions, of desiring to enslave the conscience and trample out intellectual progress.

We do not speak here of what has already been touched upon in this paper—the other great divergence between the claims of the Catholic prelates and the Government measure—we mean the divergence as to the equal share of the endowments and other privileges which the Catholics ought to enjoy. It is fair to say, and it was urged by the admirers of the Government measure, that supposing the Catholics to come in to the new plan, supposing the University Council fairly constituted, supposing the examinations fairly conducted, and everything else connected with the University to answer the expectations of the framers of this scheme, it would undoubtedly have been possible for Catholics, in the course of a generation, to have gained the enjoyment of a large proportion of the University emoluments and offices. This was the meaning of those who declared that the object of the Bill was to redress the hardships under which Catholics now lie. If they swallowed the principle of Mixed Education; if they educated themselves at the Catholic University or College, unaided as it would be by the State, while every other College was richly subsidized, and if with all these disadvantages they proved themselves the best scholars in the University, they would gain University prizes, win professorships, and the like. This was supposed to be enough for a Catholic people! What is this but to say that the Catholics are the bulk and flower of the nation, and that Protestants and Secularists are not likely to beat them in the long run, however heavily they may be handicapped? Surely, the question is, not what Catholics may do under all disadvantages, but what it is fair

for a liberal and impartial Government to allot to them in the distribution of the public money for educational purposes. Four students present themselves at the doors of the University created for Ireland by a Government whose chief boast it is to have wiped away the disgrace of centuries, and inaugurated a new era of peace, equality, and prosperity. One is an Episcopalian—he represents a body which is a fraction of the nation. Another is a Presbyterian—he is one of another fraction. A third is a lax worldly Catholic: he represents, perhaps, a couple of hundred families in the immense bulk of the nation. The last is a good Catholic: he has behind him some millions of Irishmen. The Episcopalian is comfortably lodged in Trinity College, which has £50,000 a year: he may be as well off, perhaps, as the scholar of a College at Oxford, and all educational advantages are secured to him by endowment. The Presbyterian, perhaps, has no great objection to Trinity College either. The bad Catholic is welcomed with enthusiasm. He is a vessel of election. The British Parliament has legislated specially for him. The Consolidated Fund groans with burthens for his advantage. He can go to any one of the Queen's Colleges, with £10,000 a year each. "Dear child," says the maternal State, "the fondest wishes of my heart are gratified in thee! Come! you shall have prizes and pocket money in plenty! Come, you shall have a Froude to teach you history; you shall have a Fawcett—who cannot teach without offending the consciences of bigots—to teach you Political Economy! Come, there is plenty of room, make yourself at home, take your time, we shall not be too particular how many marks you get." The State presses the bad Catholic to her bosom, and caresses him as Dido caressed the boy Ascanius. As for the fourth applicant, he must go where he can, "no Catholic need apply," there is no endowed home for him. But the State has still some consolation for him. "Go—you are the child of a brave and active minded race, full of intelligence, full of energy, full of mental vigour. *You* dont need endowments. Want is the nurse of genius. It would be insult to offer to coddle you like these other babies. I have not the slightest doubt that you will beat them all when you have trained yourself, and meanwhile, as Horace says—with whose lines you are doubtless familiar—

Angustam amice pauperiem pati
Robustus acri militia puer
Condiscat!

And yet, be quite sure, I am treating you as kindly and lovingly as I treat the rest."

And yet, let us observe how entirely the promoters of the Bill reckoned without their host as to their own indulgence to Catholics. These possible advantages which they no doubt meant Catholics to jump at and hold their tongues about them, were just sufficiently veiled in the Bill, as it was drawn, to excite the suspicions of the inveterate enemies of Catholic prosperity in every form. If it were not so sad a spectacle to see legislators and public writers lending themselves to fan the flame of the most childish bigotry by suggestions of every degree of reckless absurdity—not to speak of means of a far graver moral complexion—the outcry against the Bill on account of those provisions in it which were supposed to favour Popery and Ultramontanism would have been ludicrously amusing. Mr. Horsman—of whose disgraceful speech Mr. Gladstone said that he had never heard a speech in the House of Commons that appeared to him more unhappily directed to frustrate every useful and beneficial object of legislation, every desire that a wise and beneficent Parliament entertained in regard to education in Ireland—declared that considerable portions of the Bill had not been drawn by a Protestant. It is quite certain that Mr. Horsman was by no means singular in his opinion that some great concessions had been made to the Catholics, and that more were intended to be made in the working of the Bill, and that it behoved all good and true Englishmen to be on their guard lest a bill which was designed especially for the relief of Catholic grievances should do anything but enhance those grievances.

We have said quite enough to point out why it was impossible for Catholics to accept the Bill as it stood. The resolutions passed by the Archbishops and Bishops pointed to "opposition to the passing of the Bill in its present form," and to "petitions to Parliament for the amendment of the Bill." And yet it is a simple matter of history that it was the opposition of the Catholic prelates to the Bill which gave the measure one of its best chances of success. It is quite certain that if the Catholic prelates had accepted it, a storm of fresh agitation against it would have arisen, on the ground that it was all an arrangement between Mr. Gladstone and Cardinal Cullen. As it was, many people believed that the opposition of the Catholics was a sham. It was this utterly unreasoning bigotry of the English and

Scotch public which really defeated the Bill, because it pressed with so much weight upon Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, that they could not or would not venture to do anything towards satisfying the Catholics, while, on the other hand, concession after concession was made to the advocates of Mixed Education. Almost every speech made by the Ministers on the successive nights of the debate contained an assurance that something or other which was supposed to be favourable to Catholics was "not of the essence of the Bill," and might be got rid of in Committee. At last Mr. Cardwell closed the debate of the penultimate night of the discussion with a speech which left very little more for any one else to sacrifice. This was the course of action pursued by a strong, courageous, resolute Ministry: a Ministry which has been accustomed to its majorities of a hundred, the men composing which are men of the highest character for persistency in their measures as well as for patriotic devotion to the labours of their office! It may even be a source of deep congratulation that the country was spared again what it has seen when a weak Ministry has been in office but not in power, obliged to carry through a bill, such as the last Reform Bill, which it was agreed must pass, and yet with hardly any control over its provisions. But we point to this lamentable chapter in the history of the Ministry of 1868 chiefly for the purpose of pointing out what it was that really ruined Mr. Gladstone's measure. It was not, as a matter of fact, the Catholic vote. It was the pressure of English bigotry on the subject of Education, of English hostility to anything that would put power, however legitimately, into the hands of Catholic bishops and priests, that forced on Mr. Gladstone the production of a measure which could never have satisfied Ireland, even if it had been passed as it was printed, but which he was obliged to mould, every day more and more, into a shape which would have given it the character, not of a bill merely unsatisfactory to Catholics, but of a bill whose provisions would have amounted to little less than fierce educational persecution, a bill which would have aggravated tenfold the very evil which it professed to remedy.

It would be difficult to estimate the amount of misrepresentation, whether of the Bill or of the Catholic prelates who opposed it, which was put in circulation in order to aggravate the public bigotry. We have already said that even the most respectable London papers—such for instance as the *Guardian*—spoke of the Catholic bishops as requiring nothing short of

their own "ascendancy" in the University. "It is of no use," said the paper we have named, and which we name as representing the very highest type of conscientious English journalism, as the *Times* represents the lowest type of the same journalism, unrestrained by any regard to conscience whatsoever—"it is of no use to make studied arrangements for conciliating an ecclesiastical party which is determined that it will not be conciliated by anything less than the surrender of University studies into Ultramontane hands."* That is, to demand equality is to demand dominion—to insist that the Catholics of Ireland have a right to be taught by Catholics, to have their own College in a National University, to have a fair share in emoluments and endowments, and to be fairly represented, along with others, in the Governing Body which regulates examinations and the like—this is to be determined to be conciliated by nothing but by the absolute surrender of the whole management of the University studies, whether in their own College or not, into "Ultramontane hands." We take the liberty of saying that this is a glaring and groundless misrepresentation; and that its appearance in the pages of the *Guardian* indicates the degree of heat to which anti-Catholic prejudice was worked up during the excitement of the late debate.† Indeed, we believe it to be the mournful truth, that

* *Guardian*, March 12, p. 333.

† When the division was a week old, and the Ministerial Crisis had brought people somewhat to their senses, we find a change for the better in the tone of the *Guardian*, and a change, if possible, for the worse in the tone of the *Times*. The following passages from a leading article in the first named paper are fair enough, but if they are fair, what becomes of the statement, in the same paper, which we have quoted above? "A fortnight ago," says the *Guardian*, March 19, "the Irish Roman Catholics had a very good case. Persons strongly impressed with a particular religious conviction have a right to say that they will have their children brought up where there is a presumption that neither the habits of their daily associates nor the teaching of their instructors is calculated to shake that conviction. If these persons constitute, as they do in Ireland, the bulk of the people, they have a further right to require that public money shall not be used to confer advantages in which they cannot share, except at the risk of having these convictions undermined. And in the particular case, we know that the keenest promoters of mixed education in Ireland value it not merely for itself, but also as a means of destroying priestly influence, which they look upon as the root of evil in Ireland. And it is trifling to disguise from ourselves that this priestly influence means Roman Catholicism in its present form. The allegation that there exists in that free country a great anti-sacerdotal laity, which can but does not dare to exhibit itself, and requires the cooperation and protection of Government, should not be taken into account. In such a case, if in any, 'De non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio.'

"Roman Catholics, therefore, have a right to object, if they choose, to mixed education. And, what is material, they have also the power to make it ineffective.

no more reckless storm of misrepresentation has been let loose in this country since the days of the "Papal Aggression" mania than that which raged during the late discussions.

We select two instances of current misrepresentations—not of the Catholic prelates, because they are the born objects

Owing to their hostility, the Queen's Colleges have become expensive institutions for the use of the minority, while the primary schools (as well pointed out by Mr. Chichester Fortescue) have been wisely allowed by successive Governments to become practically denominational. And it will be observed that those who actually handle Irish affairs—Lord Mayo, Mr. Fortescue, and Lord Hartington, become alike impressed by the justice and necessity of what is not very happily called concession.

"Under these circumstances, we go so far as to think that Roman Catholics might fairly have claimed that secondary instruction should be left to such institutions as are or may be established or endowed for the purpose otherwise than from the public revenue, all having equal access to certain honours and emoluments conferred by an Examining Body, or University, not concerned in teaching, and so constituted as to secure an impartial distribution of what it has to bestow." Now, is not the scheme here sketched out in an Anglican newspaper identical in principle with that demanded in 1869 by the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops? If so, what becomes of the charge that the latter will be satisfied with nothing less than the absolute surrender of University Studies into Ultramontane hands? The writer then goes on to say that in one respect the Catholics asked for more than the boons here mentioned. "They make it a grievance that they are not wealthy, and require to be endowed at the expense of the public, in some proportion to the Protestant, and we may almost say Imperial, establishment of Trinity College. And this they do while the cry for nonendowment which procured the destruction of the Irish Establishment is scarcely out of their mouths." Here the writer seems to have forgotten himself. In the first place, Catholics do not absolutely require to be endowed at the expense of the public, but they do ask to be treated *equally* with their fellowsubjects who form the minority of the nation of which they are themselves the immense majority. "Put us on an equal footing," they say, "whether it be one of poverty or one of riches: especially if you make us members of the same National University with the Protestants and the Mixed Educationists." The Irish Archbishops and Bishops, in their Resolutions on Mr. Gladstone's Bill (Feb. 28, 1873), do not even demand endowment as the condition of the affiliation of the Catholic University to the new University, but they object in the first instance, most strongly, to the principle of *Mixed-Education* as the fatal flaw in the scheme, and complain also of the *comparative* injustice by which the new Bill, "without its being avowed," that is, as we suppose, by leaving things as they are, "gives to Protestant Episcopalians, to Presbyterians, and to the new sect of Secularists, the immense endowments for University Education in this country—to Trinity College some £50,000 or more, with splendid buildings, library, and museum; to the new University £50,000; to the Cork College £10,000; to the Belfast College £10,000; while to the Catholic University it gives *nothing*; and furthermore, the Catholic people of Ireland, the great majority of the nation, and the poorest part of it, are left to provide themselves with endowments for these Colleges out of their own resources." The next paragraph dwells on the aggravation of injustice contained in the fact that even as to such emoluments as are open to them in the new University, Catholics, "thus *overweighted*, are told that they are free to contend in the race for University prizes and distinctions." And what is the inconsistency, if people who claim equality as a right, first demand that the Established Church shall be disendowed because their own Church is disendowed, and then that their College shall be endowed if other Colleges in the same

of vilification of all sorts at the hands of Englishmen, even English members of Parliament—of the Bill itself as it was printed, circulated, and explained by its authors. One of its most famous provisions was that by which the University as such was precluded from *teaching* theology, mental and moral

University are to be left in possession of their endowments? We add the concluding paragraph of the article we are quoting, as an evidence how entirely sensible and thoughtful Anglican Churchmen can—indeed, as we think, by their principles they are obliged to—adopt the very same line of argument which we have been endeavouring to maintain—

“On the other hand, Protestant and political and academical zealots will not abandon what they suppose to be their hold on the instruction of the country, and insist on maintaining at the public expense teaching institutions for the upper and middle classes, which they hope to work in their own way. Zealots, we say, because the most temperate of them seem to be hurried along by some prepossession or theory, rather than seriously to consider what are the most effectual means for imparting the greatest amount of cultivation to the greatest number of the Irish people.

“Take, for instance, one of the most able, and, in form, quite the most temperate, of the opponents of the Bill, Dr. Lyon Playfair. It is scarcely too much to say that in defending himself from the imputation of fanaticism, he deliberately announces himself an academical pedant. It has been stated, he says, that his views were those of a fanatic. But for himself—‘He has tried . . . to look dispassionately on Ireland, not as a country inhabited by a people split up into different sections by religious differences, but as inhabited by their fellowsubjects, entitled to all that higher instruction which the State could afford.’

“That is to say, having to prescribe for the diseased state of Ireland, he not only consciously, but laboriously, shuts his eyes to the main condition under which his medicine will have to act. Speaking to an Assembly bound to guide itself by considerations of practical statesmanship, he openly avows that he turns his mind only to the consideration of an ideal, without caring to determine whether this ideal can be brought into any useful relation with the existing state of things. It is as if a gunner were to point his guns in accordance with the pure laws of projectiles, without regard to the resistance of the air. In the present case it is worse; it is, at bottom, the odious Anglo-Saxon regardlessness of what are almost the allowable prejudices of a weaker race—odious, though perhaps statesmanlike, when it is accompanied by overwhelming power—odious and unstatesmanlike in a free country.

“Possibly Mr. Gladstone may consider that the desertion of his Irish supporters at a moment when he had done so much and was endeavouring to do more for them relieves him from all further obligations in respect to the third branch of the Irish Upas-tree. And there are few who would not feel a kind of vindictive satisfaction in finding that men who had shown so little moderation or generosity had overreached themselves. But charity after all is charity, and justice is justice. The disease of the Empire is the angry alienation which subsists between Great Britain and Ireland; and the first duty of an Imperial statesman is to quiet, or, if he cannot at once quiet, then at least to put in the wrong, the feelings which are represented by ‘Home Rule’ on the one side, or ‘No Popery’ on the other. We still hope, therefore, that the Irish petulance and extravagance will not prevent the repeated consideration of any real Irish grievance. And in the present case we hope it not the less, because, with all its errors, the Roman Catholic Church is contending for a principle which we of the English Church—and, if we are right, all persons really attached to the Christian religion—are interested in maintaining.”

philosophy, and modern history. This provision was simply intended to preserve the rights of conscience. The *Colleges* might teach these subjects, the University was to examine in them, and to grant honours in them. That is, in the case of modern history, at least, these subjects were provided for more carefully than they were thirty years ago at Oxford, when there were no examinations in modern history, and in the case of all of them as carefully, or more carefully, than any subjects whatever in the University of London, which examines only, and does not teach. As a matter of fact, it is possible that the rest of the "eight first-class men" who sit in the Cabinet by the side of Mr. Gladstone, and the many distinguished Oxford and Cambridge men in the House of Commons as well, would echo the statement made by the Prime Minister, that he never but once attended a Professor's lecture at all. It is perfectly notorious that in the English Universities, as a rule, the education and instruction are done by the Colleges, the examination by the University, and if the fact that there are no University Professors on particular subjects, or no Professors whose lectures are actually attended, be admitted as a proof that those subjects are excluded from the *curriculum*, it would be difficult to say what subjects are practically taught at Oxford and Cambridge.

But notwithstanding all this, the limitation in the Bill was an eyesore to those pedants who insist on teaching everything in the lecture rooms of the same Professors to people of various denominations, and how did they express their objection? They expressed it by a courageous assertion that no such studies were to be allowed at all—*provision being made in the Bill for examination in them*. Lord E. Fitzmaurice spoke of the Bill as offering "an education from which *are excluded* those liberal studies which are now being encouraged by all University Reformers." We are very far from accusing Lord E. Fitzmaurice of being the original author of that gross piece of sophistry; but the misrepresentation to which as far as we know he was the first to give utterance in the House of Commons, was echoed by other speakers, was repeatedly propagated in the papers, and no doubt produced a powerful effect on public opinion, insomuch as our worthy friend, Mr. *Punch*, (or one of his rivals in the comic press) made it the subject of a cartoon. Let us take another still more palpable misrepresentation. There were certain clauses in the Bill which were

cleverly ticketed by its adversaries as the "gagging clauses." There is nothing like a good nickname to make a falsehood popular and effective. As to the efficacy of such provisions to secure the rights of conscience and religious feeling in the lecture room of a Professor, we need not speculate, but we shall give the evidence of Mr. Fawcett, a Cambridge Professor, as to the necessity of some such provision, in the case of the unfortunate attempt ever being made to teach Catholics and Protestants on the same benches. It is clear, at all events, that if Mixed Education on such "burning" subjects as mental philosophy or moral history is to be attempted, it is only fair and natural that there should be some authority to call Professors to account who may outrage the consciences of their pupils. The provision in the Bill was a very mild provision, for it required a *wilful* transgression to justify any action on the part of authority. The eleventh clause provided that "the Council should have power to question, reprimand, or punish by suspension, deprivation, or otherwise, any professor, teacher, examiner, or other person having authority in the University, who when in the discharge of his functions as a University officer, may, by word of mouth, writing, or otherwise, be held by them to have *wilfully* given offence to the religious convictions of any member of the University." Here again was a restriction which struck to the very heart of the bigots who wish to indulge their own hatred of religion under the professedly neutral flag of Mixed Education. They were not to be allowed *wilfully to offend* the consciences of others!

And how did they meet the question? Not by a simple confession of their inability to forego the delightful privilege here denied them, but by another courageous misrepresentation. Comparatively few people read the Bill, hundreds of thousands read the papers in which it was attacked, and the speeches of its opponents in the House. They had only to leave out the little word *wilfully*. Hear Mr. Fawcett—"He could frankly say that there was no position in life which he was ever likely to enjoy that he valued so much as the Professorship he held at Cambridge. Now, if the Prime Minister could succeed in introducing these clauses into the English Universities, he should feel that he could not conscientiously hold his Professorship for a single hour." And he went on to illustrate the case of a Professor of Political Economy who had to lecture on Pauperism, and to refer to the dissolution of the monasteries.

A student might say that to refer to them was to offend his religious convictions. But where was the word *wilfully* all the time? It was not on Mr. Fawcett's lips, it was not, we venture to say, in the minds of those who cheered him or those who read him. One of two things is evident. Either Mr. Fawcett—let us say, by a slight distraction—forgot that no Professor was to be punished unless his offence appeared to be *wilful*, or Mr. Fawcett means the world to be informed that the liberty wilfully to offend religious convictions is so essential to the exercise of his duties as a Professor as he understands them, that he could not in conscience hold his office an hour if he were liable to reprimand for so gross an outrage on decency and courtesy. And if we are to take Mr. Fawcett as a fair specimen of his class, we may gather from his avowal what sort of teaching that is which awaits Catholic students at the hands of Professors of the Secularist type. And this misrepresentation of one of the provisions of the Bill which were meant to shield the rights of conscience went the round of the papers, was repeatedly echoed in the House, and, we will venture to say, went as far as anything else of the kind to produce the general unpopularity of the measure among English Protestants.

There is some consolation for the true friends of Irish University Education in the fact that the late catastrophe was produced by so great a degree by wild, reckless misrepresentation. We call it a catastrophe, because Ireland has now for many years been looking forward to some measure of redress at the hands of the Government, and all her best friends must regret to witness the shipwreck of so many hopes. We have already sufficiently answered the question with which we began. The failure of the measure of Mr. Gladstone is really due to English and Scotch bigotry, which in the first place forced him to prepare a scheme which could not be accepted as doing justice to the Catholic claims, while whatever redress it offered was clogged with conditions of the acceptance of an unChristian education, and which, in the second place, made it impossible for him to maintain his offer, even such as it was, in its integrity, much less to mould his measure into any new shape which Catholics could possibly receive without objection. It is not our purpose to discuss Mr. Gladstone himself, or his conduct of the Bill, or to say whether any Minister could at the present moment carry through a British Parliament a measure of real justice to Catholics. We can only say that the friends of any

Minister who desired to see his name go down to posterity as that of a man worthy to guide the destinies of the Empire, would wish that he might have the courage, after proposing what he thought right, to adhere to it manfully, and stand or fall by it, rather than modify it night after night as the discussion proceeded on which its fate depended. Now that the storm of obloquy and fanaticism has passed away, and we come to examine side by side the proposals of the Government with the Catholic demands, we can see at once the reason of the Catholic objection, and, at the same time, the very narrow line which needed to be crossed in order to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the great question. Catholics demand first freedom, and then equality. Freedom is not to be had under the system of Mixed Education: it can be had in the case of a National University with denominational teaching, such teaching to be, as it is mainly at Oxford and Cambridge, the office of the Colleges who send their students for examination to the University authorities. Equality is to be had either by endowment, or by nonendowment. When Protestant Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Secularists are on the same footing as Catholics in this respect, equality will exist. Freedom and equality are the birthright of all subjects of the English crown: ought it to be impossible for English statesmen to confer on such subjects freedom and equality?

To this question one answer alone can be given. English statesmen can do this, and will do this, as soon as they are convinced of the necessity of doing it. It is not our business to praise those who are above our criticism, but we are convinced that when the history of Ireland during the present century comes to be fairly written, it will be seen that she has been ably and generously served by many statesmen, many of whom have not been her own children, but that her greatest debt of gratitude has been due to her bishops and her clergy. And we believe that the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland would have departed altogether from the firm, consistent, and resolute attitude which they have always maintained in defence of the dearest interests of the nation, if they had for a moment wavered in their objections to the late Bill on University Education. We may trust that the attitude of the leaders of the people, for such by force of circumstances the Bishops of Ireland are, joined to a similar expression of their determination on the part of the people themselves, may at length

convince, if it has not already convinced, English statesmen that justice in the matter of education is a debt which they must pay to the country, unless they wish deliberately to destroy the connection between England and Ireland. To grant this simple, obvious, elementary justice, is especially incumbent in the present Ministry, because they have undertaken, as their peculiar task, to remove the grievances which centuries of persecution and tyranny have accumulated. But it is not the work of the present Ministry alone. This is a question—and here we are glad to find ourselves in agreement with Mr. Gladstone himself—which ought to be raised above the level of party strife. Our system of Parliamentary Government requires, as it appears, the machinery of party; but that machinery is on certain occasions in the way of real progress and of the best interests of the Empire. On such occasions it has often been set aside, for English statesmen are Englishmen before they are Liberals or Conservatives. Party was set at naught by Sir Robert Peel and by Mr. Gladstone himself when they became convinced of the necessity of removing the restrictions of the Corn Laws, and the present Prime Minister is not one likely to consider the food of the mind of less importance than that of the body. Party opportunities have often been deliberately neglected by the Conservatives, as in the case of the American War and the Alabama arbitration. There is no need, in the present instance, of any disruption of party ties; at the same time it is clear that Mr. Gladstone was right when he complained that the late measure was made, far more than it ought to have been, the occasion of a simply party conflict. In the present case, no sensible person can doubt that if Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Disraeli were convinced that the question must be settled, and that it is not to be dealt with as a question of party, they could solve it in the course of half an hour's conversation with a delegate from Ireland. Mr. Bright once proposed, on a similar question, that the two Right Honourables should talk the matter over together. Both parties are ordinarily consulted on questions of national interest, and of far less than national interest, from such a question as the retention of Canada at the risk of war down to such a question as the amount of the marriage portion of a Royal Princess. The Catholics of Ireland, moreover, are contending, in truth, for a principle which is highly popular in England—the principle of religious and denominational education. To this principle the

Conservative party, in general, adhere. We have already pointed out that the Catholic claim, embracing the two points of freedom of teaching and equality of endowment, does not put them forward as equally matters of necessity. The first is a point of life and death, the second is a point of justice. And, after all, what is required to put the Catholic University on a level with the Queen's Colleges? An annual sum, less probably than what is spent in making the London parks look pretty, much less than is devoted to keeping up the household of a Royal Duke, or a lump sum about the fifth or sixth part of what would build an ironclad. Let it not be said that this is a point of principle and not of detail. It cannot be a point of principle that five or ten thousand a year should not be paid out of the Consolidated Fund for the support of Professors and students on purely secular subjects in a Catholic College on Stephen's Green, when ten thousand a year is paid out of the same fund to similar Professors and students in a Secularist College at Belfast or Galway.

Translation from Clement of Alexandria.

TO OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST.

Στόμιον πῶλων ἀδαῶν,
πτερόν ὀρνίθων ἀπλανῶν, κ.τ.λ.*

BRIDLE, that tamest the youthful,
Wing, that Thine own dost keep,
Infancy's pilot most truthful,
Shepherd of kingly sheep.

Gather Thy children around Thee,
Sweetly and simply to sing,
O Christ! that they ever have found Thee
Of saints and of children the King.

Of all things the Victor Eternal,
In sorrow that ever art nigh;
Prince of the Wisdom supernal,
Word of the Father most high.

Of mortal men Saviour, Jesus!
Sower of seed divine,
Fisher, that waitedst to seize us,
Casting Thy heavenly line.

From out of the waves Thou didst take us,
Waves of the ocean of sin,
And the charm that to join Thee did make us
Was the sweet life Thou gav'st us to win.

Lead us, then, Shepherd, Whose sheep
Are the souls of the undefiled;
Rule us, O King, Who dost keep,
As Thy chosen ones, hearts like a child.

In the footprints of Jesus leads glowing
To heaven a path sublime;
His Word from eternity flowing,
His years inexhaustible time.

* The edition of Clement of Alexandria which I have used is one which forms part of a collection entitled *Sanctorum Patrum opera polemica, &c. Patres Græci*, vol. iv. Würzburg, 1778. It may be interesting to mention that the original of the second stanza in this translation is the motto on the title page of Father Faber's *All for Jesus*.

A Light everlasting, undying
Fountain of pity to all,
Virtue and life supplying,
On the Name of God who call.

Heavenly milk that distilleth
From the breasts of the Mother of Grace—
In wisdom, O Lord, that filleth
The souls that seek Thy Face.

Let us then, babes most meek,
Who are fed by that holy dew,
That mystical breast who seek,
And hold to that Mother true,

Pure praises to Him give,
Gifts to the Teacher bring,
Whose lesson is, how to live—
Praises to Christ the King.

Who Sons of Christ, for name
Most royally are styled,
Now sing with glad acclaim,
The Mighty One, the Child.

And so, a chorus clear
From discord given release,
Walking in holy fear,
We sing the God of peace.

R. O.

Among the Prophets.

CH. XVIII.—“MOSES AND THE PROPHETS.”

WHEN the afternoon service was over it still wanted a quarter to four, and as I had had no exercise that day, and the evening promised fairly, I was glad that I had sent home the gig in which I had been conveyed to Shotcote. I found John Wilton, who had come over from Shotterton with his sister in law and her husband, as ready as myself to walk homewards, and as we were starting we were joined by Father Miles himself, who had been summoned to visit a sick person, to reach whose cottage he would have to go for some distance along the Shotterton road. I was glad afterwards that it had chanced so to be, as the good Father went on talking about the subject on which I had consulted him, and I had no other opportunity afterwards of hearing what he had to say upon it.

John Wilton seemed a good deal changed since I had known him slightly before he lost his wife. He was graver and more silent, though when he talked there was a great flow of cheerfulness and brightness about him. He had been reported to me by Malham and his wife as living very quietly, reading a great deal, doing much good, working as a magistrate, and spending much time at Shotcote with Father Miles. He had not been a widower a year when people had begun to talk of his marrying again, and one after the other of the young ladies at the Park had been naturally fixed upon as his partner. But it had all come to nothing. John Wilton had made no sign at all. Barbara married Edward Tesimond, and Grace was supposed to be destined for a convent. Before I left the country on this Christmas visit, Father Miles spoke to me of the high hopes which he entertained of Reginald and Walter, Edward Tesimond, and John Wilton. They seemed really likely to form a nucleus around which a few good young Catholic gentlemen might gather for purposes of public good. At this time, it seems, they were discussing the expediency and practicability

of setting up a new Catholic organ, which was to appear two or three times a week.

But I must devote my present chapter to a short account of my conversation with Father Miles on the subject of the supposed failure of Christianity. I can only epitomize it here. Father Miles began by saying that the main question was whether Christianity was true, and that arguments from results could never be more than secondary in strict logic. The argument for Christianity from its effects upon the world was one of the most beautiful of evidences; but, after all, the failure of results, as seen here, could never be a fatal argument against it, because it assumed a certain intention as to its outward success which had to be proved. Our Lord's account of the future of the Church and of His religion seemed to be summed up in the words in which He said that the Gospel was to be preached as a witness to all nations. This was strictly analogous to the character of His own preaching and that of the Apostles. But a witness does not imply that those to whom witness is given are all benefited by it. On the contrary, our Lord speaks in more than one place as if the good counsel of God for the healing of the world would be rejected by the greater number of those for whom it has been carried out. Such is the general bearing of many of the parables—even though some of them may be taken as having no further historical reference than to the Jews of His own time. Such is the inference to be drawn from that remarkable illustration which He used at one time about "the children sitting in the market place," as if every kind of evidence or testimony were to be addressed to the world, and perversely neglected by men. The account given by our Lord of the future, in His last great prophecy on Mount Olivet, before His Passion, does not certainly seem to promise universal success and dominion to the Church; though that remark was also to be qualified by remembering that the prophecy in question relates directly to two points alone in the future: the destruction of Jerusalem and the signs of the end of the world. If we take this idea of the Church on earth, that it is to be a testimony to the world, it does not require that we should expect more from her than that she should maintain her own divine character and show that she had the support of divine power to authenticate her mission.

At the same time, as our Lord was called the desired of all nations, and as so much was said by Christian writers as to the

supply of all the needs and cravings of human society in Him and in His Church, it was only natural to look to His influence on the world as a result by which His loving presence was made known, and, indeed, to require that Christian Apologists should be able to show, now at least after the lapse of so many centuries, that the evils of humanity had truly been cured by the Church. But there was no difficulty in doing this, Father Miles told us, if only all things were considered in the argument which had a right to be considered. For instance, as to prophecies, such as those contained in the latter portion of *Isaias*, it must first be settled whether they are to be understood of the spiritual kingdom or of the visible kingdom of God on earth, and even then it must be remembered that we do not know how many centuries more may have to elapse before the consummation of all things. Every generation of Christians, from the time of the Apostles downward, has expected the speedy advent of the end, and the common opinion now entertained that it cannot be much longer delayed has no more right to be accepted as truth than similar anticipations of former times. If that be so, the triumph of His Church may come hereafter, and not in our own time. "It seems long," said Father Miles, "since the day of Pentecost: but after all, the production of great results on human society, as such, is a matter of long time, though it may not take quite so long to create a Christian system of life in its every development as to heave up a continent from the bottom of the sea. The researches of science are all supposed to point to a very long series of ages before the appearance of man upon the earth, and perhaps when that future which is now the subject of prophecy shall be read in the light of heaven hereafter, it will be seen how much longer than was imagined the life of the Church upon earth was destined to last. At all events, it is extremely rash and unreasonable to find fault with the Church because she has not as yet done what we may expect her to do.

"In this way, as well as by what I have already said about the testifying office of the Church, I should be inclined to answer the complaints which are made as to the state of those parts of the world which have as yet not submitted themselves to the yoke of the Gospel. Moreover, unless I read history fancifully, the Church has frequently appeared to be on the point of achieving great results, which might have led to splendid and lasting conquests, and she has but just been baulked, as it were, of her aim. At other times a great blow has fallen upon

her, in punishment for national sins, or to humble the schismatical or heretical spirit. There was a time, even under the Roman Emperors, when it was almost likely that the Empire itself might have been Christian long before Constantine. If the Empire had become Christian while it was yet possible to stay the progress of corruption and dissolution, which was the irresistible result of paganism, we might have seen the whole world made Christian under the protection of the Roman eagles. The greatest external foe which the Church has ever had was Mahometanism, and yet this arose as it were to chastise the Eastern Empire for its heresies, schisms, and fanatical spirit, and it has only just reached, as it seems, the appointed limit of time during which it was to be permitted to blight the fairest regions of the earth. As to the Turks themselves, who at one time seemed to threaten the extinction of Christendom, Dr. Newman has pointed out a time when they might have been crushed before reaching the zenith of their power. As Mahometanism was the greatest external foe of the Church, so her greatest external work has been the formation of Christian Europe. This was a work which cost her many centuries; and it was seemingly broken up before its completion by the Reformation. Since that time the tendency of society has been to emancipate itself from Christian rules and Christian traditions, and so to incline once more to dissolution and decay; but it remains to be seen whether the Catholic forces, the only true forces in the world, may not in the end triumph over the principles of evil. One thing is certain, that the drama, so to call it, is on a large scale, and its catastrophes and *denouements* take centuries to mature. There was little apparent hope for the Church externally, or rather let us say for Christian society, ten years or so before Constantine's victory; and yet that victory only brought to light the issue of the tranquil unseen work of three centuries. The result had been so long prepared, that it cost the world little, so to speak, to put on its Christian garb. So it may perhaps be that a few years hence men may see the fruits of the reaction which has been going on since the Great Revolution, even though the struggles of evil just before the triumph of good are very terrible, and seem for the moment to overwhelm society in confusion. What we can judge of truly, as far as we can judge of anything at all, is the tendency and character of the force displayed by the Church. The limit to which this force reaches may depend

upon the ordinary laws which guide Providence, laws which never set aside the influence of human liberty to mar and distort the good gifts of God and seemingly to disappoint or defeat His intentions.

"But if the Church be judged in this way—by the natural tendency of her influence on society in all its grades and forms, then it cannot be denied that she has proved herself divine. I am not going to expand," said the good Father, "on the subject which has so often been treated by the Christian writers or preachers of our time. The Church can make man perfect, entirely happy and satisfied, in the practice of every virtue and the development of every faculty of his nature in due relation to the rest and to the whole. She can and has created the family, she has made every natural relation and tie and duty glow with heavenly light, and has brought back the days of Paradise and anticipated the ages of heaven. So with the perfect community, the perfect State, the nation, the empire, the brotherhood of Christian peoples. I say she has shown that these things can be, and furnished the grounds and reasons for their existence in all perfection, while here and there, and now and then, she has shown them in actual existence, while the reasons which have prevented them being universal are none of her authorship. Or to take the individual man, her saints show us perfection, sublime and heroic virtue, the tenderest as well as the strongest graces, in every age and condition and circumstance of life, while their sanctity is in all cases the fruit mainly of means of grace which are common, and exist under the conditions of usual daily existence. Wonderful as the saints are, it is more wonderful, in this point of view, that all Christians are not saints than that there are some saints among Christians. But a single saint, so long as it were certain that his sanctity was the regular fruit of the ordinary means of grace, would prove what those ordinary means of grace are—would prove the existence in all of divine supernatural power ordered for the healing and perfection of mankind in general. If you are to test a principle or a medicine or a mechanical force fairly, you need do no more than see what it can do in a few instances when there is no irregular impediment to its working. If people who possess it do not choose to use it, you blame them for the non-production of its natural results—you do not deny that it can produce them. So if you take a few prominent instances of the working of grace, either in individual persons or in communities—and take these instances from more modern

times if you like—and find in them the old power which energized in the early Church, conquered the world, and Christianized the barbarians from the North, it is enough to show that we have a power still in its vigour, for which no results are too high or too hard. Let the rest of the argument for Christianity be lost, and take these later ages, the period in which we still are. Take the crown of saints of the post-Tridentine epoch, St. Francis Xavier, St. Philip, St. Teresa, St. Ignatius, and the rest. Take the Church of Japan, the Reductions of Paraguay, and some of the work which has been done almost in our own time among the Indians of America. None but a divine power can account for all these phenomena, and the real question is the presence of God in the Church, not the exact amount to which that presence has overcome the wilful waywardness of men who are not forced to submit to it, in His Providence, by anything that constrains their will."

CH. XIX.—AN ENGLISH RÉNAN.

JOHN WILTON, who took far more part in the dialogue than I did, and put in a word here and there of comment or even of objection, in order to bring out more clearly the Father's meaning, spoke to him of a book which was then making some stir among young men of his own standing with whom he still occasionally corresponded, though they had gone very far in the latitudinarian direction, while he had been now for some time a devout Catholic. It was a beautifully written book, he said, or rather written by one who could write beautifully, if he could only free himself from affectation. It was, in truth, a book against Christianity, though there were a great many passages full of admiration for our Lord's character, as well as for the grandeur of the Bible, which, however, of course was treated like any other book. As for mysteries, miracles, the proof from prophecy, the writer simply set them aside with contempt. There must be a new basis found for that measure of adherence to Christianity which the author advocated. What struck John Wilton was that a book like this was looked upon in some quarters as an advance towards belief and as a contribution to literature or the ends of religion.*

* See two letters in the *Spectator* (April 12 and 19) entitled *The Clergy and the Church*, and *The Church and Modern Thought*—in reference to the writer in question, who in the last of the two is compared to Comté, as "a great, an almost irresistible, because at once competent and unprejudiced, witness to the power of Christianity."

"Whether it be an advance towards belief or not," said Father Miles, who seemed to have read the book in question, "depends on the amount of belief which the writer's former works contained, and as to that I am hardly able to speak. Whether such books can help any one on towards faith and religion, depends on the state of heart and conscience of the several persons across whose path it may fall, and the amount of enlightenment which they already possess. A book that might unsettle the faith of a bad, careless Catholic, might help a soul which had been brought up without any religion to gain a higher perception as to our Lord. There is no doubt that the character, actions, and words of our Lord, which are the kernel of the New Testament, have always exercised a sort of fascination over the enemies of the faith, and, as we are not speaking in the presence of any one whom such an illustration might offend, we may consider it a sort of faint repetition of what took place when the devils acknowledged Him to be the Son of God. Again, everything is turned to good by Divine Providence. The manifestations of spirit-rapping itself have been used to lead some people to recognize the existence of an unseen world and the immortality of the soul, who did not believe those truths before. If people mean that in this sort of way, as truth is indestructible and as its power cannot be quenched by the enemies who use its fragments in order to encrust their own fictions upon them, the grains of truth which are to be found in books like this, may do good, that I would not question. But, putting aside the relative character and influence of such works, I cannot doubt that they are positively bad in themselves. They are among the signs of the feebleness, the frivolity, the childishness of the age, and these qualities can hardly characterize a generation unless it is to a certain extent voluptuous, selfconceited, and hardhearted."

"I fear," said Mr. Wilton, "that the age is voluptuous and hardhearted enough. But what exactly do you mean by its childishness and frivolity, as exemplified in this literature?"

"I mean," said the Father, "that the method and argument in such books is not worthy of serious men who understand what is at stake, who have a feeling of responsibility, and who acknowledge the laws of reasonable argument. What is at stake is the religious faith and practice—'conduct' it is called in the book before us—of a large portion of the community, at all

events. Now, how does this book, for instance, proceed? It professes to disengage the pure ore of the real teaching and character of our Lord from the veins in which it is embedded—those veins being the books of the New Testament, and to detail true religion from the *Aberglaube* which has overgrown it. This is done by means of criticism, and, as to our Lord, the one satisfactory instrument to be used is internal evidence. Now, nothing but the most careless frivolity can fail to perceive that this practically means the treatment of the New Testament record as a child treats a collection of toys—choosing what he likes to play with, and discarding the rest, and taking up first with one and then with another. No one can be so innocent in his blindness as not to see that what one child likes another may not like; and if there is to be no instrument but internal evidence, it is obvious that there is no standard by which his application of this one instrument can be regulated. The particular child whom we have before us happens to set a high value, for instance, on the Fourth Gospel—which for convenience sake he calls John's—another of his playfellows, whom he seems desirous to emulate, thinks nothing of the Fourth Gospel, and a great deal of the Synoptists. Another thinks that the most authentic parts of St. John are the narratives, and that the discourses are all the manufacture of the writer: this child, on the other hand, holds by the discourses and thinks nothing of the narratives. It is simple child's play—child's play with the documents on which, when the Church is set aside, the greater part of religious Protestants build their faith in God and in Jesus Christ. There is no criticism at all—no examining of passages, or manuscripts, or authorities—all is settled by the simple *ipse dixit* of this or that particular child. It is granted in the book before us, that the 'reporters,' as they are called, are honest: but then they were influenced by what they expected, and so came to believe in miracles, and they made our Lord say what they thought He ought to have said, or they jumbled up one occasion with another, and so misrepresented Him. But then, happily, we have our prophetic child in the nineteenth century—a child not at all, of course, affected by the influences of his own time, as those poor Apostles who laid down their lives for the truth of their testimony were affected by the influence of theirs. *He* understands Jesus Christ; he can tell us what He meant; he can point out to us, in a

discourse in St. John, where the 'true ore' is to be found, and where the alloy begins.*

"Now all this is essentially childish and frivolous. I prefer using the word childish to the other epithets which might be naturally applied to a man who thought that when he has laid down the principle that *his* intuition as to internal evidence may be safely trusted as a guide to distinguish in the same verse of St. John the half that is really 'true ore,' the words of Jesus Christ, from the half that was added by the 'reporters,' the rest of the world will be restrained by a sense of his sublime success and unquestionable sagacity from setting to work on the same principle, kicking all his positive results and affirmations, as they are called, to the winds, and reducing the historical facts as to our Lord to the simple truth of His existence, while they deny every one of the words and actions attributed to Him by the 'reporters.' If the writer expects that he will be allowed to build when the edifice raised by others has been destroyed, he

* It is impossible to quote a tenth part of the passages by which this statement could be justified. One or two may suffice. Thus (p. 174) the author is dealing with our Lord's words, "He that believeth in Me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." He then quotes other similar expressions of our Lord's and lays down his own authoritative interpretation of what our Lord meant. "But," he goes on, "the reporter explains: 'This He said concerning the Spirit (*Pneuma*) which they who believed on Him should receive: for *Pneuma* was not yet, because Jesus was not glorified.' *A clearer instance of a narrow and mechanical interpretation of a great thought can hardly be imagined*: and the words of Jesus Himself enable us here to control the inadequacy of the interpretation, and to make it palpable." Even waiving all questions of St. John's inspiration, it is clear that Mr. Arnold is quite sure that, man against man, he has much more a certain insight into our Lord's meaning than the writer of the Gospel. Let us give another instance, as to the words of our Lord Himself as reported in St. John. After saying that the text about the Three Heavenly Witnesses is an "imposture and an extravagant one. It shows us, no doubt, theologians like the Bishop of Gloucester already at work," &c., he then goes on—"something of the same intention is unquestionably visible—never, indeed, in Jesus but in the author of the Fourth Gospel. Much of the conversation with Nicodemus is a proof of it—the twenty-sixth verse of the sixth chapter is a signal proof of it." (We remark, by the way, that Mr. Arnold seldom quotes chapter and verse, and, in a considerable number of cases, misquotes and distorts the text.) "One can here almost see the author, after recording Christ's words, '*Every one that heareth and learneth of the Father cometh unto Me*,' take alarm at the notion that this looks too downright and natural, and sincerely persuaded that he 'did something' for the honour of Jesus by making Him more abstract, bringing in and putting into the mouth of Jesus the forty-sixth verse—'*Not that any one hath seen the Father, except He that is from God—He hath seen the Father*.' The verse has neither rhyme nor reason where it stands in Christ's discourse; it jars with the words which precede and follow, and is in quite another vein from them. Yet it is the author's own; it is no interpolation" (p. 163). What a curious book the Gospel according to Matthew Arnold would be? Possibly we may yet have it.

must have an unusually large share of the true spirit of the nineteenth century, which certainly believes in itself with a depth of conviction of which there is hardly any trace in former ages.

"But there is something more to be said about the insufferable character of the negative part of these arguments. The Christian proof, the proof from miracles and prophecy, from the purity and holiness of the Gospel law, from the marvellous propagation and influence of the Church, is a proof which comes from the same hand that made man and gave him his intellectual faculties, his freewill, and his conscience. I do not deny that certain aspects of truth fit into one generation more naturally and more forcibly than into another, and that thus there may be a certain variability as well as a certain growth and development about the Christian demonstration. But this does not excuse from childishness and impertinence the writers—for they are a class, and the author you allude to may be one of the best and most earnest of them, for all I know—who talk so glibly and daintily about the beauties of our Lord's character, and righteousness, and meekness, and what not, when they are pulling up, radiant with smiles, the intellectual and reasonable foundations on which God has built our faith. I call them impertinent in order not to use words expressive of stronger indignation which might perhaps be more appropriate. Books of this kind, when one has swallowed down one's anger at them, remind one of poor Hotspur's 'popinjay,' who pestered him so much when the fight was done,

—he made me mad
To see him shine so brisk, and smell so sweet,
And talk so like a waiting-gentlewoman—

and all this mincing and scented nonsense about *Zeit-geist* and *Aberglaube* and 'sweet reasonableness,' 'the sovereign'st thing on earth' for the inward bruises of our poor sinful bleeding nature, is but a poor compensation for the loss of faith. There is not an ounce of good solid manly logical reasoning in such books ordinarily. They remind one of Rénan's 'Tout porte à croire,' 'il est permis de douter,' and the like phrases, by which the most atrocious charges against our Lord's veracity and honesty were sometimes so politely ushered in. No doubt there is some fault in the way in which the Christian evidences are presented to thoughtful Englishmen of the present generation.

Miracles and prophecies are never extinct in the Church, and the Anglican attempts to draw a line between Scripture miracles and Apostolic miracles and ecclesiastical miracles is open to a palpable logical objection which those men can see. Much the same may be said of the argument from the purity and sublimity of the Gospel, and from its miraculous spread in the world. These arguments for Christianity lead straight to similar arguments for Catholicism, and these men are trained to reject without examination the argument for Catholicism. Still, after all, in ordinary cases the truth remains, that people cannot reject the Catholic evidences when fairly before them without grave fault, and the Catholic and Christian evidences remain what they have been from the beginning—the proper appointed instruments to lead the human mind to the knowledge of God."

"Some men," said Mr. Wilton, "seem not to have the power to believe. They would give anything in the world, they tell me, to be as I am in this respect."

"I do not judge individual men or characters," said Father Miles. "Still, Mr. Wilton, there must be daily before our eyes an exemplification of that deep truth which is enunciated in the parable, 'That if men hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead.'"

"I have often wondered," I said, "at that saying. Perhaps it is one of those passages which the writer of whom we are speaking could get rid of."

"It certainly looks like an addition of the 'reporter's,' in his theory," said Father Miles. "I don't know, though—for he takes every opportunity of distorting our Lord's sayings into depreciation of the evidence from miracles. But, as you say, it is a saying which may well make us wonder. The persons spoken of are worldly men, brethren of the rich glutton, probably leading lives no worse and no better than the life which he had led—men immersed in the enjoyments of life, with a certain amount of refinement, and no active charity or mortification. We should be inclined to think that if a messenger from the dead had appeared among them, they would have been frightened and converted. The parable tells us that they would not. Their hearts would have been as insensible to Lazarus coming from the grave, as the heart of their brother had been insensible to Lazarus lying in rags and misery at his door. In the first place, they would probably have disbelieved in the message. It would have been to them what 'La Sallette and

Lourdes,' at which this writer sneers, are to the men of the present day—not a fact to be examined and sifted, but a thing that no one with any culture and criticism about him, no one who had listened to the teachings of the *Zeit-geist*, could possibly attend to. Another thing that must be remembered is this—a thing of course utterly incomprehensible to people like the writer of this *Literature and Dogma*. It is that external means, or human means, even the careful application of criticism in the hands of men of illumination equal, or but little inferior, to his own—would be of no avail without the grace of God. As for such doctrines as the natural dependence and weakness of man, or the effects of original sin in making him still more in need of grace, and the like—of course the *Zeit-geist* has put all such delusions on the shelf. It unfortunately remains true that without assistance from God, man cannot avail himself even of God's provision for him. If men, then, reject, as St. Luke says of the Pharisees and Scribes, 'the counsel of God towards them,' they put themselves at once in an attitude of resistance to Him, and forfeit their chance of grace. Thus, if 'Moses and the Prophets' were the appointed means for the conversion of worldly men like those spoken of in the parable, even if they were not in themselves the most powerful and appropriate means—that conversion would not follow on the use of other means, however startling, because grace could not be there to make such means efficacious."

"The men I speak of," said Wilton, "are very good; some of them religious minded, selfdenying, active in charitable works, and as far as we can see, unstained in character. Yet they tell me they cannot believe."

"Faith," said the Father, "is a gift of God. If they pray, faith will not be denied them. But neither faith nor any other gift is to be taken for granted as a matter of right, and there are sometimes instances in which men have to be convinced that it is a gift before they have it. And then, as far as their opportunities go, these men should take the other ordinary means of a study of the plain old proofs which have satisfied thousands like them. It is 'Moses and the Prophets,' after all. It is not conceivable that the evidence of the Truth should be unacceptable, or submission to the Truth too great a difficulty for ordinary human minds, with the help of grace."

"This is just one of the things which the writer you are so hard upon denies," said John Wilton.

"Yes, he denies it in a passage,* not quite so profane as that in which he speaks of the Blessed Trinity as 'three Lord Shaftesburys,' but which makes one turn away from him with great repugnance certainly. Anyhow, be sure of one thing. If the people are taught to reject the ordinary evidences of Christianity, as well as the legitimate witness of the Church, they will never be converted by finely written paragraphs about the beauty of our Lord's character and the grandeur of the Bible. This writer himself leaves out a great many of the features of our Lord's character as displayed in the Gospel, just as he picks His words to pieces, and tells us that some have neither rhyme nor reason. Others will follow his example, and make to themselves an ideal young man of the nineteenth century out of the Saviour of the world."

CH. XX.—A CASE IN MORAL THEOLOGY.

WE were drawing near the spot at which Father Miles was to leave us for his sick call, when a turn in the road brought us upon two gentlemen engaged in an animated discussion, who hardly heard our approaching footsteps till we were close upon them. The pair proved to be the two Anglican clergymen of Shotterton, who seemed to have been taking a short walk, like ourselves, after their own afternoon service. It was easy to see that they were having a battle—not, however, as it turned out, on the vestment question. Mr. Lorner was evidently put out,

* "Truly, then, some one will exclaim, we may say with the *Imitation*, '*Magna ars est scire conversari cum Jesu.*' And so it is. To extract from His reporters the true Jesus entire, is even impossible; to extract Him in considerable part is one of the greatest conceivable tasks of criticism. And it is vain to use that favourite argument of popular theology, that man could never have been left by Providence in difficulty and obscurity about a matter of so much importance to him. [This is not quite a fair statement of the argument.] For the cardinal rule of our present inquiry is that rule of Newton's: *Hypotheses non fingo*; and this argument of popular theology rests on its eternal hypothesis of a magnified and non-natural man at the head of mankind and the world's affairs. And a further answer is, that as to the argument itself, even if we allowed the hypothesis, yet the course of things, so far as we can see, is *not* so; they do not proceed in this fashion. Because a man has frequently to make sea-passages, he is *not* gifted with an immunity from sea-sickness: because a thing is of the highest interest and importance to know, it is *not*, therefore, easy to know; on the contrary, in general, in proportion to its magnitude it is difficult and requires time" (*Literature and Dogma*, p. 176). It is of no use confronting childishness with argument; otherwise certain sayings of our Lord, as recorded by His "reporters," might be quoted in answer to this.

and this, I suppose, made him ready to appeal, as he did almost before we had greeted them, to Father Miles as to the point in dispute. I was highly amused to see the Catholic priest made the arbiter in a discussion between the two clergymen. Father Miles at first declined, in a joking way, to settle the question ; but Gerald Merton, goodhumoured fellow as he was, and far more master of his temper than the other disputant, asked his opinion so courteously, that all difficulty was removed. "It is not on any point as to which we unfortunately differ from your Church, Father," he said, "and I shall be quite willing to take your advice on the matter, provided it is possible to follow it in our Communion."

Lorner stated the case with some eagerness and temper, Gerald quietly correcting him here and there, but there was no difference as to the facts. One of his own servants, his mother's lady's maid, was going to be married to a young tradesman in the town. The future bridegroom was a Scotchman, bred as well as born on the other side of the Tweed. I don't exactly know to what Christian, or nominally Christian, community his parents had belonged, but Lorner, who was a sort of father confessor to the young woman, had found out that it was very doubtful whether he had ever been baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. I don't remember the particular grounds on which Lorner argued ; but there was no record of the baptism, and there were strong grounds for thinking that some other form was used by the minister of the congregation of which the parents had been members. It was not certain, even, who had performed the rite, and the father was known to have had a habit of talking against infant baptism. However, both clergymen agreed that the baptism of the man was doubtful. This was the state of the case. Lorner insisted that the young man must be baptized before he could be married, whereas Gerald Merton argued that as there was a possibility, or even a probability, that he was a Christian, there was no need for any such requirement. As Lucy was quite under Mr. Lorner's thumb, she was obliged to object, rather against her will, and the bridegroom, who had been courting her for more than a year, was rather angry, declared that he was to all intents and purposes as good a Christian as Mr. Lorner himself, and was threatening to break off the match.

"I think," said Father Miles, "that you might perhaps be obliged to marry them, if they will, by the law, but as to that

I may be mistaken. I suppose, however, that I may consider that the first question is agreed upon by both of you, that a Christian marriage can only be between Christians; though I confess that there are many people in this country who would not say so."

"We are agreed upon that," said Gerald. "My point is that we may fairly assume the man to be all right, and Lorner says that we must make sure in a case of marriage. I don't see that. There is a reasonable probability that all is as it ought to be. That is enough to act upon."

"There is a strong positive doubt," said Lorner. "I hold marriage to be a sacrament: we all hold it to be a most solemn union. If there is no true marriage, the man may leave the woman, or the woman the man, and they can only live together without sin by believing that there is no flaw in their union. Now, this young woman knows perfectly well that unless the man is a Christian by baptism, she cannot be really his wife before God. In such a case, then, I say, a probability is not enough against a doubt. We must have certainty—such certainty as can be had."

Father Miles looked amused. "You seem to have studied moral theology, Mr. Lorner," he said. "Now, Mr. Merton, how can you answer what he says?"

"Probability is the guide of life," said Gerald. "How do I know that I am myself baptized? It is only a reasonable probability. We all act on such grounds."

"But if there is a strong positive reason for doubt?" said Father Miles.

"Well, one would rather have a certainty, of course. But there are probabilities on both sides here, and we may set one against the other. It might be safer to have the man christened, but we are not always obliged to do what is the safest."

"If the man were dying," said Lorner, "would you not baptize him? Is there not sufficient positive doubt to make it incumbent on you to give him the sacrament of regeneration?"

"I think if he were dying," said Gerald, "I should urge him to be baptized."

"Because baptism is a sacrament necessary to salvation, and because it would be wrong not to secure him the benefit of such a sacrament?"

"Certainly."

"And is it not the common doctrine, Father," said Lorner,

"that we must take the safer course, and secure ourselves by it, in the case of a sacrament?"

"It is so," said Father Miles, "in the case of any sacrament—Orders for instance. Of course, the case is as strong as possible about Baptism, without which no one can enter heaven. There are, however, some sacraments as to which there is a special importance on another ground, namely, that their defect affects other people. A person as to whose orders there was any doubt would do a great injury, possibly, to thousands of others to whom he administered sacraments which had nothing in them on account of his want of orders. If he had any doubt himself, he would sin mortally every time he acted in doubt in such grave matters. "I think," he added, turning to Gerald Merton, "you should try to get the man baptized conditionally. It would not be difficult to persuade him so far. There need be no ceremony or service; simply let him be baptized with the right form."

"I hope you do not imagine," said Mr. Lorner, "that I have any doubt as to my own orders. I thought, perhaps, what you said just now was meant for me."

Father Miles smiled. "You see what I get, Mr. Merton, for interfering in your controversies. No, Mr. Lorner," he went on, "I should be sorry to suppose that you or any other honest man would act as you do with a serious conscious doubt as to the validity of your orders. At the same time, forgive me if I say that you ought to doubt very much indeed. There are quite as strong positive reasons against the validity of your orders as there are against this poor fellow's baptism. Some of your own authorities have even gone so far as to condemn the Swedish orders, on grounds which only form a part of the strong probability against your own. I only say this because you asked me the question. Now you must really excuse me, as I must hurry on to my poor sick child, a mile off."

John Wilton and I walked on by ourselves, and after going for a moment into the Manor, whence he fetched a little present for his cousin Louisa, he accompanied me to her home. He told me a good many things about Mr. Lorner which I was surprised to hear, and seemed to think that his influence on the Miss Norths was not altogether happy.

*Canon Estcourt on Anglican Ordinations.**

CONTROVERSY is to literary history what war is to ordinary life. Its course is wayward and irregular; the din of battle is often heard the loudest round some strategic point, in itself unimportant. The eagerness of strife carries away the meekest and the gentlest to words and deeds, hard and merciless. Upright combatants are betrayed into stratagems and ruses which do not bear to be examined too closely in cold blood. Every feeling seems swallowed up in the desire of victory. The Anglican Ordination controversy forms no exception to the rule. What contests were fought over that pretty mare's nest, the Nag's Head consecration! How seriously, too, the champions on the Anglican side repeated the tale that Pius the Fourth, or Pius Quintus, as Chief Justice Sir Edward Coke made him out, or Paul the Fourth had offered to sanction the Book of Common Prayer! What volumes have been written for and against the Lambeth consecration! How much has been said on the Lambeth Register! What blows have been exchanged, since William Champney fired his stray shot and challenged Mason to produce evidence that William Barlow, the consecrator of Parker, was himself a Bishop! to say nothing of the unrelenting, never ceasing questions as to the matter and form of the Sacrament of Order.

The reviewer must take history as he finds it; it is idle for him to complain that human nature is human nature, that war is war. He must chronicle every phase of the fight impartially: he must condemn harshness and unfairness: he must sift the tale, and try to show where the fortune of war favoured the one side and where the other. Not the least pleasant portion of his task is to record the deeds of the mighty and the brave, who in battle forgot not the virtues of peace and contended without rancour. Canon Estcourt is entitled to the praise of a knight *sans peur et sans reproche* in this war of Anglican Ordinations. He takes his side manfully; there is no possibility of doubting

* *The Question of Anglican Ordinations discussed.* By E. E. Estcourt, M.A., F.A.S., Canon of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. London: Burns and Oates, 1873.

what are his convictions; he aims his blow wherever he sees a flaw in the armour of his adversary. But he writes without bitterness: he understands his subject thoroughly; he knows the merits of his side and the value of his arguments, but he does not claim for his conclusions a greater certainty than his arguments warrant: he is aware that he is handling a question on which the Church may some day speak definitively, though the Council of Trent refused to do so, and he offers his conclusion, subject to the decision of the Church. We are the more disposed to insist on this moderation in Canon Estcourt, because some other writers assume a confidence in their assertions which is entirely out of place and very much prejudices the interests of truth.

Canon Estcourt has been fortunate in discovering various documents which throw light on some of the historical questions connected with this controversy. Two of these refer to William Barlow's consecration. The very name of William Barlow is enough to strike terror into the minds of general readers: his consecration seems an endless riddle. We shall try to give a popular summary of the matter in dispute, and then the reader will understand the value of Canon Estcourt's contributions to the history. William Barlow was an apostate Augustinian monk, who distinguished himself by his abject servility during the Reformation period. He was the ready agent of Anne Boleyn, of Henry the Eighth, and of Cromwell. In October, 1534, he was sent on a mission to Scotland; again in February, 1534-5; and a third time in January, 1535-6. On the 16th January, 1535-6, he was elected Bishop of St. Asaph; on the 10th of April he was elected to St. David's. It is beyond doubt that he was in Edinburgh on the 23rd of April of that year; and it is beyond doubt that he took his seat in the House of Lords on the 30th of June, "for which purpose he had only to present the writ of summons that had been issued on the 27th of April, in consequence of the grant of temporalities. He is then described in the journals as *Episcopus Menevensis*."* If he was not consecrated on the 30th of June, it is assumed that as he had obtained the temporalities of his see, possession, and a seat in the Lords, he would not have troubled himself about consecration.

Godwin had assigned the 22nd of February, Dr. Lee the 23rd of April, and Mr. Haddan the 11th of June, as the date

* P. 67.

of his consecration. Canon Estcourt adduces good reason to believe that he was not consecrated on the 12th of June. "Howard and Barlow were attended in their embassy by Thomas Hawley, Norrey King-at-Arms, who went in their company from London, and did not return till the 12th of June, on which day he presented himself to Cromwell, and received a warrant from him for payment of his 'dyetts.' He would have left Scotland in company with Howard, because the embassy was then at an end, and therefore it seems probable that Barlow, who remained behind, could not have arrived so soon. But in addition to this, the same document, dated 12th June, describes Barlow as 'the Bishop then elect of St. Asaph, now elect of St. Davyes,' and *therefore he could not have been consecrated on the day before*, as such a circumstance would certainly have been known to Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General."* And he concludes, "The whole time left for him to be consecrated is reduced to a period of seventeen days, viz., between the 12th and 30th of June exclusive."† The warrant from Cromwell to Sir Bryan Tuke to pay Clarencieux, King-at-arms, his "dietts" for attending the King's Ambassadors to Scotland, 12th June, 1536, is given in Appendix VI.

Canon Estcourt adds a second valuable documentary argument against Barlow's consecration. It is drawn from an examination of what Mason had published as the *Restitution to Barlow of the Temporalities of St. David's*. Mason had given a wrong reference to the record, and when after some search it was discovered, it turned out to be, not a restitution in its usual form, but "a grant of the custody of the temporalities on account of the vacancy of the see," and "with the extraordinary addition of 'to hold to him and his assigns for life.'"‡ "So far from giving any evidence of his consecration, it rather implies the probability that he had not been consecrated, and that he was made and entitled Bishop without consecration. And the enrolment was made in the office of the Exchequer, as if the matter were purely secular, instead of on the Patent Rolls in Chancery.§

We recommend the examination of this curious document to our readers; it will be found in Appendix IV. Canon Estcourt is certainly not unreasonable in his conclusion. "The case, therefore, remains a mystery. It is a mystery how he

* Pp. 66, 67.

† P. 79.

‡ P. 72.

§ *Ibid.*

could have remained unconsecrated, or how he could have carried on his assumed character unchallenged, especially as he was involved in disputes with his Chapter. But with so many circumstances of suspicion, arising from different quarters, yet pointing the same way, it is impossible to admit the fact of his consecration without more direct proof of it."*

A far more important historical fact than the consecration of William Barlow is the conduct of the Roman Catholic Church in regard of the Anglican Ordinations. Canon Estcourt establishes beyond any doubt that the Holy See has never wavered in her practical rule of action: from the days of King Edward to the present time she has treated the Anglican Ordinations as utterly null and void, as not merely irregular, but as invalid. To Anglicans as well as to Catholics this is or should be the cardinal point of the controversy. Whatever may have been the motives which determined the rule, in the end the theological controversy will be decided in accordance with the rule, the rule will not be modified to meet the last theological explanation which can be devised.

In the Faculties granted to the bishops by Cardinal Pole,† we read the clause, "*in suis ordinibus, etiam ab hereticis et schismaticis Episcopis, etiam minus rite, dum modo in eorum collatione Ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata.*" And it occurs repeatedly in similar documents and dispensations of Queen Mary's time. Could a modern theologian distinguish more precisely the irregular ordination, *minus recte*, and the invalid ordination, *dummodo in eorum collatione Ecclesiæ forma et intentio sit servata*?

As if to place the significance of these words beyond the possibility of doubt, a clause is introduced, *et non promoti, ad omnes etiam sacros et presbyteratus ordines a suis ordinariis, si digni et idonei reperti fuerint, rite et legitime promoveri*, taking it for granted that there were among the clergy some *non promoti*, not truly ordained, because the *Ecclesiæ forma et intentio non fuit servata*, the form and intention of the Church had not been observed.

In 1727, Cardinal Noailles, in his condemnation of Le Courayer's book, says—"We will only tell him that a Catholic theologian ought to speak with more respect of *the practice of the Church*, to propose to her with modesty his doubts and reflections, to wait her decision with a submissive disposition

* P. 81.

† Appendix xviii.

and not to prescribe laws to her in a presumptuous manner, nor to call ignorance and prejudice whatever is contrary to his opinion." *

The censure of the bishops of France on Courayer's works repeats the same charge—"Il ne se contente pas d'avancer sur l'Ordination des Anglois avec une hauteur indecente, *des opinions contraires* de son aveu à la pratique de l'Eglise Romaine." †

Canon Estcourt goes through with much pains the judgments of Queen Mary's reign, and the more generally known instances, in which the validity of Anglican Ordinations has been submitted to the judgment of the Roman Catholic Church. Our readers must go to his pages for these exemplifications of the practice.

Anglican writers attach much importance to the opinions of individual theologians who have declared themselves in favour of the validity of these Ordinations. It would be a curious inquiry how many of the so called defenders of the validity of Anglican Ordinations are only strong disbelievers in the Nag's Head story, or champions of the genuineness of the Lambeth Register, or convinced of the fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth, or content to take refuge behind Courayer's dictum that the essence of the Sacrament of Order consists in "Imposition of hands and prayer in general: that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the bishop elect all the graces of which he has need for the worthy discharge of the functions of his ministry." It would be a still more curious inquiry what answer these defenders would make to the question placed in this way, "The See of Rome has constantly and consistently and uniformly rejected the validity of Anglican Ordinations; she has never treated them as even of doubtful validity. Can you show in her faith, or in her practice, or in her theology, any principles contradicted by this her rule of action? Can you show ordinations conferred in any schismatical body, or in any heretical body, which she has admitted as even doubtfully valid, and which you can place on a level with the ordinations of the Anglican rite? Or, can you show any instance in her own communion wherein, through accident or design, the rite of ordination has been pared down to an equality with the Anglican rite, and yet been allowed as a valid ordination?"

The theology of the Sacrament of Order is confessedly in a state of formation. At present, theologians can only grope their way towards certainty: the profoundest theologians cannot

* Appendix xxix.

† Appendix xxx.

advance beyond a probable opinion, an opinion which carries weight as far as the reasons by which it is supported. Dr. Lee complained that the opponents of the validity of Anglican Ordinations have not been consistent in their line of argument; or as he offensively expresses it, "It should not remain unnoticed that those whose *presumed interest* it has been to endeavour to cast doubt upon, and to disparage our Ordinations, have never, for any long period together, been agreed as to what was their specific defect."* And he proceeds to state that for many years the objection taken was to their illegality, by reason of their presumed infraction both of the laws of the National Church and of the State of England. That after 1604 the Nag's Head Fable became the rallying point. That subsequently fresh ground has been taken up.

The facts are, (1) that no writer of any weight ever assigned the *illegality* of the Anglican Ordinations as a reason for considering them *invalid*. (2) That those who are made most merry over the Nag's Head Fable did not deny the *validity* of the Ordination because it was said to have taken place at the Nag's Head, but because a mockery of an ordination was supposed to have been gone through. A true bishop, using a sufficient form in the Nag's Head, would have been guilty of a profanity, but the Ordination conferred would have been a valid one. (3) There is more consistency and less divergence in the theological arguments used by successive writers on the Catholic side than Dr. Lee ever dreamt of when writing with so much assurance.

Let us see how Canon Estcourt states his argument, premising again that the Church has not defined the essential matter and form of the Sacrament of Order, and that the question is one open to free discussion. He takes his starting point from a decision of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, dated 9th April, 1704, on the case of the Abyssinian Ordinations. The Decree is published in the Appendix, No. XXXIV., for the first time. Curiously enough, one week later, the same Congregation answered the appeal of John Clement Gordon, who had been consecrated Bishop of Galloway according to the Anglican rite, and pronounced his consecration and ordination invalid.

The Abyssinian Abuna, it appeared, held ordinations only occasionally, and ordained many thousand candidates on one

* Dr. Lee, *The Validity of the Holy Orders of the Church of England*, p. 329.

and the same day. On each of the candidates for the priesthood he laid his hands and said, "Receive the Holy Ghost." Each candidate for the diaconate he simply touched on the head with his patriarchal cross. Naturally enough in the confusion of a church crowded with several thousand *ordinandi*, some did not receive the imposition of hands, to some the words "Receive the Holy Ghost" were not addressed, and not a few were left without matter or form. The point of the decision, as far as the Anglican Orders are affected is, that the Inquisition allowed the validity of the Abyssinian Ordination in all cases where beyond a doubt the *ordinandus* had received the imposition of hands, accompanied by the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost." The ordination of deacons was pronounced invalid.* The Anglican rite enjoins the imposition of hands, and it certainly contains the words "Receive the Holy Ghost." Yet within the month of April, 1704, the Holy Office decided in favour of the validity of the Abyssinian Ordination and against the validity of the Anglican Ordination.

Before assigning the reasons for these two decisions, for one moment let us turn to Courayer's dictum, that the essence of the Sacrament of Order consists in the imposition of hands and prayer in general, that is to say, the invocation of the Holy Ghost to obtain for the bishop (*v.g.*) elect all the graces of which he has need for the worthy discharge of the functions of his ministry. According to this definition, the benediction of an abbot or abbess would be a sacrament; for "the bishop gives the imposition of hands with prayers to invoke the Holy Spirit for the graces of which the new abbot has need to acquit himself worthily of the dignity he receives."† The consequence condemns the premiss from which it was drawn. Courayer's dictum must be corrected, and he himself furnishes the principle on which the correction must be based. "The addition of words which corrupt the due sense of the sacramental form destroys the truth of the sacrament, . . . but if such an addition be made as not to take away the due sense, the truth of the sacrament is not destroyed." The like principle of course applies to alterations made in the way of omission, namely, that if words pertaining to the substance of the sacramental form were

* *Ordinatio presbyteri cum manuum impositione et formæ prolatione, prout in dubio, est valida: sed diaconi ordinatio cum simplici crucis patriarchæ, impositione omnino invalida est.*

† P. 197.

omitted, the sacrament would be rendered null and void ; and such would be the effect if the alterations went to deprive the words of their due sense and meaning.*

Now what Courayer states of the Anglican rite is perfectly true ; it nowhere expresses *directly* or *indirectly*, *implicitly* or *explicitly*, the idea of a sacramental grace conferred, nowhere the idea of spiritual power, nowhere the idea of priestly or episcopal power, nowhere the idea of a spiritual character, nowhere the idea of a sacrificing priesthood. So that the case against the Anglicans stands thus—You laid aside the rite of the Western Church ; you introduced a new fangled rite of your own ; you denied to that rite the virtue of sacramental grace and power ; you made such denial a portion of your teaching and your belief ; you rejected the Sacrifice of the Mass, and with it a sacrificing priesthood in the New Law ; you compelled ministers and laity to subscribe to such teaching ; you framed your rite in conformity with these ideas, and therefore, though you retain an imposition of hands, though you may employ the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," even though you may have subsequently introduced into your form the words *bishop*, *priest*, you have destroyed the sacramental efficacy of the rite of ordination, you have mutilated the sacrament in its essentials, as effectually as if you had omitted the imposition of hands or suppressed the words "Receive the Holy Ghost."

On the other hand, take the bare rite found in Abyssinia—the simple imposition of hands, with the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost." No form could be more general, more indefinite as far as the mere words. The order conferred is not named ; the priesthood, the power of sacrificing, are not hinted at, the very sacrament is passed over ; and yet the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition allowed the validity of the Ordination. And why ? Because the circumstances, the publicly professed faith of the Abyssinian Church, her priesthood, her Sacrifice of the Mass, all imparted to the simple rite a meaning and significance which sufficiently determined the imposition of hands, and the form, "Receive the Holy Ghost." Bare as the ceremony is, it says implicitly, "Receive the Holy Ghost ;" receive the grace of a sacrament ; receive spiritual power from on high to consecrate the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, to bind and to loosen ; receive this sacramental deputation to the ministry of the priesthood. Here there is no mutilation of an appointed

* P. 198.

ceremony to meet heterodox opinions regarding the nature of a sacrament; here there is no idea of suppressing all profession of belief in a propitiatory sacrifice, the renewal of the sacrifice of Mount Calvary; here there is no attempt to deny the priesthood of the New Law. On the contrary, the ceremony is the recognized rite of a Church perfectly orthodox in its belief on all these points, and as it retained what has been commonly considered of the essence of the Sacrament of Order, the ordinations conferred by it were admitted in Rome.

The cogency of this argument evidently lies in the fact that the Anglican Church rejected the true faith regarding the Sacrament of Order, regarding the sacrifice and priesthood of the New Law. This is not the place for a minute justification of this statement; those who wish to examine it thoroughly and calmly will consult the pages of Canon Estcourt. There they will be able to trace step by step the influence of the Reforming errors on these important doctrines; they will trace the thoughts of the leaders of England's apostacy; they may follow out the careful mutilation of the ancient prayers of the Church. To those who have neither the time nor the inclination for such an inquiry, we recommend the broad popular statement of the same argument.

"But the arguments now brought forward are not new, although they may be put in a new form. The absence of the sacramental character is a defect which was pointed out from an early period. The defect of excluding the power of sacrifice is the principal ground taken from the first. The first writers maintained the antecedent necessity of the delivery of the chalice, and of the formula, *Accipe potestatem offerre, &c.* Talbot, Lewgar, and Le Quien insisted on an antecedent necessity for words expressive of the power to consecrate the Eucharist. It is shown that both points are errors in fact. 'Therefore,' exclaim the Anglicans, from Mason to Elrington, with Dr. Lee and Mr. Haddan reechoing the cry, 'therefore our Orders are clearly valid.' 'Not so fast,' replies the Catholic; 'it may be true that there is no antecedent necessity for the use of such words, but you cannot deny the doctrine, nor exclude the gift, nor ignore the power expressed in those words, without overthrowing the validity you are so anxious to establish. And this exclusion is the effect of the mode in which your Anglican form was changed from the ancient rite.'"

"Here it is that Dr. Newman's argument comes in with so much force, namely, that the Apostolic Succession, the sacramental gift of Holy Order, the Holy Sacrifice, are not traditions among Anglicans. 'There is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have.' It is in vain to reply with the *tu quoque* argument, that at a certain time or times in mediæval ages, and throughout whole countries, the clergy are said to have forgotten their divine mission, to have fallen into a lamentable state of corruption and unbelief, to have neglected the sacraments, and to have been ignorant of the proper mode of administering them."

"Even admitting the worst of such statements to be not overdrawn, the whole Church was a witness against ecclesiastics so lost to a sense of what they were; the faith which they were bound to profess, the books of divine offices, the sacraments themselves, though neglected, the sacramental forms and the solemn rites with which the priestly character had been conferred on them—all would rise up in judgment against such a generation and condemn it."

"But the Anglican clergyman who disbelieves the Apostolical Succession has no such witness against him. The view that he takes is the only legitimate inference and the practical effect of the forms with which he was 'admitted to priest's orders.' If he considers himself to have been merely admitted to an office without any special grace attached to it, those same forms of Ordinations bear him out. If he treats even with scorn the idea of any peculiar power belonging to a bishop or a priest, there is no condemnation for him in the Book of Common Prayer, or the forms of Ordination, or the Thirty-nine Articles. And if he calls the Sacrifice of the Altar a delusion and a blasphemy, he may there find authority to justify him."*

To return to the Abyssinian decision, the newly ordained priest could not open his missal, or robe himself in his vestments, or observe his rite without meeting the plainest, the fullest profession of belief in a priesthood, in a sacrifice, in the sacramental grace of Holy Order. Nay, the very stones of his churches, the prayers thoughtlessly mumbled by his uneducated flock, all proclaimed the faith of his Church on these important points. He could not deny that faith or preach against it without raising a storm of indignation, without drawing upon himself the censure of the Abuna and the authorities of his Church. He was not

* Pp. 375, 376.

compelled to seek refuge in any *disciplina arcani*, any golden thread of pure doctrine cherished fondly in secret, whispered only to the instructed few, jealously guarded from the profane curiosity of the crowd: no, in the faith of the people, in the most solemn act of public worship, in the only book of instruction and piety known, there he encountered the teaching which supplied the indefiniteness of his Ordination Form, and unerringly told him that with the imposition of hands and the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," he did truly receive the sacramental grace, the very reality of priestly power, the gift which constituted him a priest before God and before His people.

Among Anglicans how different is the case! The purest, the noblest, the most cultivated, have laboured to find in their formularies, their books of prayer, their services, their popular creed, their popular traditions, some support for faith in the Sacrament of Holy Order, in the Priesthood, in the Sacrifice of the Mass. How many have sought and sought in vain, and gone forth from the Church of their baptism, from home and from friends, from all that was dearest, because they could not see the Sacrament, the Sacrifice, the Priesthood! They wished to see it, they wished to be convinced, but they could not honestly bring themselves to say they were convinced.

After all, against the voice of plain homely common sense, subtlety and argument cannot in the long run prevail. The popular faith of Anglicans rejects sacerdotalism; nothing can be plainer; Anglicans know their thought and feeling on the subject, they with difficulty endure in their midst a small minority which avows its belief in sacerdotalism, avows its claim to priestly power and would fain persuade the Anglican world that it really does agree with their doctrine and always did agree with it. The broad fact, not to be surmounted, is that the Anglican Church, at the time of its separation from the Western Church, deliberately, officially rejected the Sacrament of Order and denied the Priesthood, and cut down the prayers and rites of ordination and sacrifice to the level of this denial.

When William Barlow consecrated Matthew Parker at Lambeth (supposing him to have been duly consecrated himself), according to the Ordinal of Edward the Sixth, he acted as the minister of the Anglican Church, as the very obedient servant of the Crown, he had the intention of doing what the Anglican Church intended him to do, he laid hands on Parker, and he prayed that he might have the grace of God

with him in the sphere of duties to which he was called. There was no question here of the private opinions of William Barlow: there was no question of a distorted intention on the part of that individual. As Canon Estcourt has shown, all the steps in the consecration of Parker had been carefully considered, nothing had been overlooked: that consecration was to be in every sense the act and deed of the Anglican Church.

Now, those who entertain the faintest doubt of the intention of the Anglican Church to eliminate the Sacrament of Holy Order and the Priesthood and Sacrifice, we invite to read Canon Estcourt's careful investigation: with more than enough of pains and industry he describes the errors of the chief Reforming sects, the Lutherans and Zwinglians, traces their influence on the Anglican Reformers, compares the pontificals and missals of the old and the new religion, and arrives at the irresistible conclusion, one with the popular conclusion, that the Anglican Church was committed officially to the denial of the Sacrament of Order, of the Priesthood, and of the Sacrifice.

Barlow was the minister of this heretical Church, spoke her mutilated prayers, went through her mutilated rites, and in his hands the essence of the sacrament was impaired by the omission of what was of vital importance, of all the chief significance of the sacramental rite, of all allusion direct or indirect to the grace of the sacrament. He acted as the minister of a Church which denied all sacramental power to her ministers. He admitted Parker to the ministry by a rite which was shaped so as to reject all sacramental power; he ordained him in such fashion that he could not have sacramental power—therefore, we conclude, he admitted him a minister, a bishop (if the title be cared for), but he conferred no grace upon him, he left him as he found him, a priest, whom no mere names or change in worldly rank could consecrate in the sight of God, or the judgment of the Church.

The practical rule of the See of Rome has been to treat ordinations conferred according to the Anglican rite as utterly invalid. Canon Estcourt has attempted to assign the theology of this rule. In our judgment he has succeeded perfectly, but we must ask our readers and his readers to remember that absolute certainty is not claimed for his conclusion and explanation. The conclusion is a scientific one; the Church has not defined the question: the Council of Trent positively refused to

define it; for the present it has no authority beyond the authority of the arguments by which it is established.

Theology is a science whose domain is always extending. Successive controversies, disputes, heresies, have added to the number of conclusions, now perfectly certain, which a few years ago were held as probable by perhaps a majority of theologians, and now are accepted as certain by all. The Sacrament of Matrimony furnishes a very striking illustration. When Benedict the Fourteenth published his great work, *De Synodo Diocesano*, it was a disputed question, whether the priest giving the nuptial blessing, or the contracting parties, were the minister of the Sacrament of Matrimony. And Benedict the Fourteenth himself, though adopting the opinion that the contracting parties were the minister, yet allowed the other opinion to be a probable one, chiefly on account of the great names by which it had been supported.* At the present day no theologian could maintain that opinion without considerable rashness. The disputes between the civil and ecclesiastical powers on the subject of marriage have made it clear beyond the possibility of a serious doubt, that the minister of the sacrament is to be found in the contracting parties.†

We may hope that ere long fresh light may be thrown on the question of the Sacrament of Order. There are not wanting indications that the materials are at hand which would furnish a definition of the matter and form of the Sacrament of Order. Canon Estcourt's volume we hail as a valuable contribution to the theology of the Sacrament of Order. He treats a leading question from a practical point of view, with great erudition, with abundance of illustrations from the rites of various ages and countries, and with a full knowledge of what has been already said by the greatest theologians on the subject. He starts with no pet theory, with no system to be defended at all hazards, with no preference for one school over another. At the same

* "Utriusque opinionis solidiora fundamenta innuimus, non animo quemquam inducendi ad unam aut alteram amplectendam; sed ut Episcopis sit persuasum, utramque esse probabilem, suosque habere magnæ auctoritatis patronos, atque inde non decere discant, ut ipsi Judicis partes assumant, quæstionamque definiant, de qua Ecclesia nihil hactenus pronuntiavit, sed Theologorum disputationi permisit" (Bened. XIV., *De Synod. Dioces.*, l. viii., cap. xiii., n. 9).

† The teaching that the contracting parties are the minister of the sacrament is plainly involved in the words of Pius the Ninth in his Consistorial Allocution, September 27, 1852: "Inter fideles matrimonium dari non posse quin uno eodemque tempore sit sacramentum . . . ac proinde a conjugali fœdere sacramentum nunquam separari posse."

time, we warn our Anglican readers to remember the conditions of the inquiry. Canon Estcourt has not set himself to bring together the names of many estimable individuals, who perhaps feel very certain on the validity of Anglican Ordinations—priests, laymen, architects, Christians at large, eccentric Christians—who who perhaps feel very certain the other way. His aim is more definite, and, shall we say so? more scientific. He inquires has the Church any determined law of conduct? What is that law when she is called upon to pronounce on the validity of Ordinations conferred among Anglicans, among the Abyssinians, among her own children when through accident or design her accustomed rite has been deviated from?

Given her law of conduct in the several authentic cases known to have been decided upon by her, given her unvarying and consistent law in the case of Anglican Ordinations, what theology lies at the back of her practical rules? Can we frame an opinion, build up a scientific statement, which shall comprise all her practical rules? Canon Estcourt thinks we are justified in teaching that the essential matter and form of the Sacrament of Holy Order consist in the imposition of hands and some form of prayer, which implicitly or explicitly shall invoke on the candidate for the priesthood or episcopate the grace of the Sacrament of Order, the sacramental power of the priesthood or episcopate. The rite of Anglican Ordination he rejects (scientifically), because that rite was deliberately framed on a denial of the sacramental grace of Order, and on a rejection of the Sacrifice and Priesthood of the New Law.

Here is a matter for grave reflection to Ritualists, and indeed for all Anglicans. There is the hard fact that the See of Rome, which is bound in so many ways to seek for Truth, and considers the reiteration of the sacrament a sacrilege, has always condemned their Ordination rite as invalid, almost in the same sentence which allowed the validity of the Abyssinian Ordinations, though at first sight the Abyssinian Ordination is incomparably more jejune and bare than the Anglican Ordination. Then there is the harder *quæstio juris*—Is it true that the Anglican Church denied the sacramental grace of Holy Order and still persists in that denial? Is it true that she rejects the Sacrifice of the New Law?

Are her ministers then without the grace of the Sacrament of Order? Are her priests shorn of the power to sacrifice? Are they without an altar?

Dark and dreary and cheerless is our life here below, if Calvary is to us in this nineteenth century only a memory ; if we are less cared for than the Jews of old ; if the cold, chilly, stunted ritual of Anglicanism is all left to us by Jesus Christ, to sustain us, to cheer us, to strengthen us : without altar, without crucifix, without priesthood—oh, there is a void for head and for heart, for sense and for feeling !

Anglicanism has lost all the pomp of religion, all the glory of the house of God, because she surrendered the victim—because she drove forth her priesthood. Would the life could be called back ! Would that the dead bones would once more live ! Would that the echoes of cathedral and parish church might once again waken to the *Credo* of the Church of All Ages that all might find the Truth, and Peace through the Truth, and union in the one Body, under the one Head !

G. P.

Early English Hymns to the Blessed Virgin.

THE following hymns have been selected from the *Old English Miscellany*, published in 1872 by the Early English Text Society, and are laid before our readers as a little tribute to our Blessed Lady at the commencement of her own month of May. They are taken from manuscripts of the thirteenth century in the British Museum and other libraries. On the general interest of the volume in which they have been published it is hardly necessary to dwell. Its contents speak for themselves. They form quite a collection of little sermons and poems, replete with manifestations of the nature of the popular religion of the thirteenth century, and a very plain, solid, and outspoken practical religion it evidently was. The subjoined hymns bear sufficient testimony to this fact, though chosen for the occasion with special reference to the subject of devotion to the Blessed Virgin. The hymns have been arranged in modern garb, with as little interference as possible with their language and structure in the original quaint old English in which they were written. One reflection is necessarily suggested by their perusal—the proof they afford, if proof were wanted, of the perfect identity in devotional thought and practice between the thirteenth and nineteenth century in the Catholic Church. Plainly, in the matter not only of devotion to the Blessed Virgin, but of the general phases of dogmatic foundation and emotional manifestation, to be guilty of a cant expression, the Catholic of the thirteenth century would find himself as much at home in the modern church as the Catholic of the nineteenth century would be could he travel back through the ages and place himself in the midst of a congregation of the thirteenth. It would be superfluous to do more than point out the simple childlike loving faith that these hymns display. There is a genuine ring about them, untinged by anything like sickly sentimentalism, that cannot be missed by the reader. The tenderest love of the Mother is combined with the fullest recognition of the love and majesty of the Son. There is no clouding of His work—it is only thrown out in fuller manifestation, and the whole rests upon a good solid practical groundwork of English common sense. They are, in fact, no result of any strained effort to write religious poetry, but the natural and spontaneous outcome of a true and real spiritual life.

THE ANNUNCIATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY.

From heaven to earth God greeting He sent
By a holy Archangel—to Mary he went;
Full mild was that Maid with all beauties besprent.

Then Gabriel greeting her, thus sayeth he :
 O Maiden most blessed, while Maiden thou be
 A Child shall be born and engendered of thee,
 Believe me, Mary.
 Answered him Mary, in accent most mild,
 How comes it to pass that I can be with child?
 For with knowledge of man I have ne'er been defiled.
 In dread was that Maid.

My heart thy sweet tidings right gladsome have made,
 God's handmaid I own me, and well have I sped ;
 His Will be accomplished as thou hast just said.
 Now pray we our Lord, wheresoe'er we may be,
 Who sent the Archangel, sweet Maiden, to thee,
 For love of His Mother so gentle, that He
 May bring us to bliss that lasts endlessly.

THE FIVE JOYS OF THE VIRGIN.

Here begin the Five Blissess of our Lady St. Mary.

1. Lady, for that bliss of thine,
 The bliss that first thy bliss begun,
 When thou couldst say on word divine
 That Jesus was to be thy Son ;
 Through such a world as this
 In sins our race we run :
 Oh, help us not to miss
 The life that is to come.
2. Mother, happy was thou then
 When thou sawest heaven's King
 Born of thee, but not with pain,
 That shapèd us and everything :
 Shield us from our foe
 And give us thy blessing,
 And keep us evermo
 From every wrong doing.
3. Lady, if thou wert right
 To be so glad and blithe
 When Christ put forth His might
 And rose from death to life,
 That all the world did dight,
 Yet child of woman is.
 Then let Him wash us white
 With those five Wounds of His.
4. When from the Mount of Olivet
 Thy Son was rising up the sky,
 Thy eyes were sweetly on Him set,
 For He was to thy heart anigh.

And there too He has made thy seat
In one high place for thee designed,
Whom Angels like to come and greet,
Thou art so winning and so kind.

5. Last the King thy bosom bore
Fetched thee up to heaven to get thee
The bliss that had been lost before
And beside Himself He set thee.
Of old thou wert His choice
And fairly did He greet thee :
Then how didst thou rejoice
When Angels came to meet thee !

Mother of Mercy, Maiden kind,
I pray thee as my power is,
Let the world not make us blind—
The world is full of enemies.
Oh, that thou help us at life's end,
Thou that God and Man didst bear,
And us all to heaven send
When this world fails us, is my prayer.

Hear, Jesus, what Thy Mother says,
That is so beautiful and bright,
That is Queen, most sure it is,
Of heaven and earth by truest right.
Make us clean of all our sin
And give our eyes the endless light ;
Mean us for heaven and bring us in ;
Lord, have the will, Thou hast the might.

AN ORISON OF OUR LADY.

On her is all my life along
Of whom it willeth me to sing,
And speak her praises there among—
She true remede began to bring
For hellish pains that are so strong :
She brought the bliss that is so long
All through her childing.
Her I bid to hear my song.

Man who thyself wilt never know—
Man who thyself wilt never see—
Through foulest filth 'tis thine to go,
And food of worms at last to be.
Here blissful days thou hast not three,
But all thy life is spent in woe,
Thee truly death shall overthrow
Highest when thou seemest to show :
In death thy life shall ended be,
And in wild weeping all thy glee.

Early English Hymns

World and wealth, they will deceive thee,
 Both one and other is thy foe ;
 If the world with smiles receive thee,
 What is it, but to work thee woe :—
 Let pleasure then once overgo
 And of good it will bereave thee :—
 Sure then folly 'twere to leave thee
 For lustful moments one or two
 To dree hell's pains for evermo ;
 Be sure, O man, thou do not so.

AN ORISON OF OUR LADY.

On her I rest my life along,
 Of whom I will the praises sing ;
 Her I will herald men among ;
 She did for us deliv'rance bring,
 From pain of hell so sharp and strong ;
 She brought us bliss so sweet and long—
 All through her holy childbearing.
 I pray her grant unto the song
 I now indite, a good ending ;
 Though we do wrong.

Thou art our health and life and light,
 Thou helpest all the human race,
 By thee we are full richly dight,
 'Tis thou bestowest joy and peace.
 Thou broughtest day and Eve brought night,
 She brought us woe, thou bringest right,
 She brought us sin, thou bringest grace ;
 Oh, look to me, thou Lady bright,
 When I shall quit my earthly place,
 As well thou might.

This world shall all to ruin go,
 With sorrow and affliction sore,
 And all this life we shall forego,
 Nor is it well to grieve therefore.
 This world is not without our foe,
 For which I think to let it go,
 And square my deeds by God's wise lore :
 Earth's pleasure is not worth a sloe,
 My God, Thy mercy I implore
 For evermore.

A fool too long I've borne to be,
 My folly turns to guilty fear :
 I've loved to have delight and glee,
 And proud and dainty robes to wear :
 Delusion all I plainly see.

Therefore I purpose sin to flee,
And all my past besotted cheer.
Look, gentle Lady, pray I thee ;
Uphold and cherish, teach and rear
Poor wayward me.

For guilt I cry me welladay,
Sinful I am and sad and wretched ;
Lady, be thou my timely stay.
Ere to the grave me death hath fetched,
Repent I will without delay.
Then let me live and mend my way,
Lest by the devil I be caught :
I sorrow for my sinful play :
I reckon not of this world so gay :
Mercy I pray.

A SONG TO THE VIRGIN.

Of one that is so fair and bright
Velut maris stella,
Brighter than the day is light,
Parens et puella—
I cry to thee, see thou to me,
Lady, pray thy Son for me,
Tam pia,
That I may come to thee,
Maria.

In sorrow counsel thou art best,
Felix secundata ;
Of the weary thou art rest,
Mater honorata :
Pray to Him in mildest mood
That for us shed all His blood
In cruce,
That we may come to Him
In luce.

All this world was sore forlorn,
Eva peccatrice,
Till our Lord therein was born
De te genitrice.
With glad *Ave* sped away
Murky night, and comes the day
Salutis ;
The well—it springeth out of thee—
Virtutis.

Lady, flower of everything,
Rosa sine spina,
Thou bearest Jesus, heavenly King,
Gratia divina.

Of all thou bringest forth the prize
O Lady, Queen of Paradise

Electa.

Maiden mild—a Mother
Es effecta.

Well He wots He is thy Son

Ventre quem portasti ;

Thee He will deny no boon

Parvum quem portasti :

So kindly and so good He is,
He hath brought us unto bliss

Superni,

That hath hidden the foul pit
Inferni.

—
Explicit Cantus iste.

A PRAYER TO THE VIRGIN.

Oh, blessed art thou, Lady, full of high heav'n's best bliss,
Sweet Mother of all Mildness—flower of Paradise !
Pray Jesus Christ thy Son Who the true Guide only is,
That wretched me, where'er I be, in ne land He miss.

I will to thee, fair Lady, mine orison begin—
O Mother, teach me sweetly thy dear Son's love to win ;
For sigh I must, nor wot I to keep my sorrow in
Till thou in gentle mercy shalt bring me out of sin.

Oft I thy dear pity seek, oft on thy great name call,—
My flesh is foul, this world is false, help me lest I fall ;
Lady, shield and keep me free from all the pains of hell,
And bring me to the blessedness the which no tongue may tell.

They make me sad, O Lady, the works that I have done,
I cry full oft, Oh, hear me—thy name I call upon—
For if I have not help from thee, other there is none
To help ; help me well thou mightst ; thou helpst many a one.

Oh, blessed be thou, Lady, who art so fair and bright,
My hope is in thee only—in thee by day and night—
Oh, help then in thy mildness, full well thou hast the might,
That ne'er for friend's friendship I lose eternal light.

Queen so bright and beautiful, thy Son's ruth I implore ;
Of the sins that I have done it rueth me full sore ;
Thee oft have I forsaken, but, Lady, never more—
For thy sake—will I hearken to Satan's crafty lore.

Oh, blessed art thou, Lady, that art so kind and bland ;
Pray Jesus Christ thy Son to me His dearest grace to send,
Where'er I be, that ere my way hence from earth I wend
I may win in Paradise the bliss withouten end.

Bright Queen of Stars and beauteous, do thou light me here—
In this false and fickle world so me direct and steer—
That at my ending day I no fiend may have to fear—
O Jesus with Thy sweet Blood Thou boughtest me full dear.

Jesus, holy Mary's Son, Oh, hear me from Thy Throne ;
To cry to Thee I dare not, to her I make my moan ;
Vouchsafe then that for her sweet sake I cleansed be so clean
That at day of doom I miss not thy fair face serene.

ANTHEM OF ST. THOMAS THE MARTYR.

Hear St. Thomas from thy throne
Whom their peer Apostles own,
Whom a joyful Martyr band
Greeted with their palms in hand :
Jesus worked a mighty sign
When He made the water wine ;
Help us, nor our prayers withstand,
Rising from thy English land :
Trusting thee we comfort win
Drawn from out the ways of sin.

Reviews and Notices.

1. *Some Elements of Religion.* Lent Lectures, 1870. By H. P. Liddon, D.D.
Rivingtons, 1872.

DR. LIDDON'S present work consists of a series of lectures delivered three years ago at St. James, Piccadilly. These lectures were very well attended at the time, and we are more inclined to wonder that they were not immediately published than that they are now given to the world. The reason for the delay seems to have been that the author hoped to make them more complete, and his Preface apologizes for the defect of his work in this regard. The lectures must be considered in themselves, as far as they go, without reference to any possible exhaustion of the subject in a treatise.

Viewed in this light, they have certain great merits, as well as certain defects. They go through a considerable part of their great subject very well. We think that Catholics are hardly as alive as they might be to the great practical importance, in the present state of religious thought in England, of courses of sermons on elementary subjects, at least in our large towns. The want is felt, no doubt, far more than by ourselves, by the Anglican clergymen of the party to which Mr. Liddon belongs—a party which, by its attitude towards Catholicism, has done as much as any other party in England to increase scepticism among the thinking classes. It is a terrible thing to do as many of them have done—assume spiritual guidance and spiritual authority over souls to an extent amounting often to tyranny, and then bind them

by the most solemn obligations never to have any intercourse with Catholics, to read Catholic books, or enter a Catholic church. No doubt it must sometimes come home very forcibly to men of this class, that they are at least bound to give some food to the hungry minds of the people better than the inconsistent utterances of the Anglican formularies, and based on less evident selfcontradictions than the Anglican position.

On its own ground, as we have said, Dr. Liddon's book has much merit. The titles of the six lectures of which it consists are almost enough to describe the course of his argument. The first lecture is on the Idea of Religion. Is it feeling? is it knowledge? is it morality? What are its characteristics? The second sermon treats of God, the object of Religion; Materialism, Atheism, Deism, Pantheism, are contrasted with Christianity in their representations as to God. There is the same discussion of various views in the subsequent lectures, on the Soul, the subject of religion; on Sin, the obstacle to religion; on Prayer, the characteristic action of religion; and lastly, on our Lord, as the Mediator, the guarantee of religious life. The treatment, if not always completely satisfactory, is in general masterly, and we need hardly say that Dr. Liddon's path runs along a line as to which a Catholic writer cannot have much to differ about from him. There are several passages of striking eloquence, but on the whole, the argumentative tone overrides the rhetorical.

The main flaw of the book lies in its defective theology. We use the word theology in its proper sense. Dr. Liddon has, no doubt, read a great many theological works. If he is not a theologian, in the strict sense of the term, there is probably no theologian at present living in the Anglican Establishment. Yet it seems to us certain that no trained theologian could have written this book: and when we turn to the footnotes and see German after German name quoted as the authorities to which the author refers, we seem to find an explanation of the curious mistakes into which he has fallen. We shall point out two or three, and we by no means intend to say that we could point out as many dozen. In the first place, the whole argument, so far as it is founded on the first lecture, is overclouded by a very inadequate idea of what religion is. Dr. Liddon's idea seems to be that it is a relation, a bond, of the soul with God, the object of its being, its friend, even its father. Except in so far as the Fatherhood of God includes the idea of Creation, Authorship, absolute Lordship and Sovereignty, even this last account of religion is inadequate: and we sadly miss in Mr. Liddon's pages that constant reference to the "*Dominus et Creator Deus*," which we should be certain to find in the pages of a theologian. If man had an independent existence, and came across God, the best and most loving of friends, the bond between the two would be that of the "religion" of which Dr. Liddon speaks.

Our next instance shall be from his Lecture on the Soul. Dr. Liddon treats the theory of Traducianism with far too great indulgence. He does not, indeed, give it the preference, but he says it "rests on too large an area of probabilities to be rejected with anything like peremptoriness." An "area of probabilities" it certainly does not rest on, for it contradicts one or two solid principles: and St. Thomas, whom Dr. Liddon might have studied more profitably than the German writers

with references to whom his pages are crowded, does not hesitate to say, "*hæreticum est dicere, quod anima intellectiva traducatur cum semine.*"* Another startling statement of Dr. Liddon's is contained in the following passage—"And, if our Lord Jesus Christ is not Himself, as being both God and Man, the object of prayer, yet His perpetual and prevailing intercession opens upon Christian thought the inmost mysteries before the Eternal Throne."† There is certainly an "if" at the beginning of the sentence, but we can hardly understand the words otherwise than as asserting that our Lord is not the object of prayer!

-
2. *Ierne of Armorica.* A Tale of the time of Chlovis. By J. C. Bateman. (Quarterly Series, vol. V.) Burns and Oates, 1873.

The fictions which aim at being reproductions of the scenery, circumstances, and manners of a bygone age are always difficult works, and it must not be supposed that in matters of detail they can hope for more than an approximation to accuracy. On the other hand, they have the great attraction which attaches to historic events and famous characters. We know of few tales of the kind that can be ranked higher than the beautiful story before us. The author has hit on the golden mean between an over-display of antiquarianism and an indolent transfer of modern modes of action and thought to a distant time. The descriptions are masterly, the characters distinct, the interest unflagging. We may add, that the period is one of those which may be said to be comparatively unworked. Few pages of history can be more interesting than those which record the first foundations of what afterwards grew to be the great kingdom of France. The Merovingians fell off sadly after the days of Chlovis, but there is every reason to think that he and his comrades in arms were the brave, chivalrous, and noblehearted men who are so graphically pictured for us in this volume.

3. Mr. Grosart has now completed his beautiful edition of the *Works of Richard Crashaw*, by the publication of the second volume. It contains, chiefly, Crashaw's Latin poems, with translations. Many of these poems have never been printed before, many others never translated. The editor also gives us a full *Study of the Life and Poetry of R. Crashaw*, as well as a memoir of his father. We shall return to this most acceptable publication.—M. Pingaud's *La Politique de Saint Gregoire le Grand* (Paris: Thorin, 1872) will be read with interest in connection with the Essay on the *Dialogues* of the Saint in our present number. M. Pingaud does full justice to St. Gregory, and his work is frequently illustrated in a very interesting manner from the Epistles of the great Pope.—*Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ qui ex antiquo jure adhuc usque vigent, et ex Concilii Tridentini decretis pro Cleri atque Populi Christiani Reformatione editis*

* Pt. i., 148, a. 2. It is fair on Dr. Liddon to say that the doctrine in question was maintained by Froshammer before he was condemned by the Church—and, we are sorry to say, a long article by him on the subject (Generatianisme) is to be found in the Kirchen Lexicon, and has been translated without remark in the French version, edited by M. Goschler—*Dictionnaire Encyclopedique de la Theologie Catholique*.

† P. 173.

diligenter deprompti, atque ex Summorum Pontificum nuperque Pii Noni tam per se quam in sacro Concilio Vaticano Constitutionibus escripti traduntur, et concinnatus, a Gaspare de Luise, etc. (Neapoli: C. Pedone Lauriel, 1873). An extremely useful work on the present Laws of the Church.—*Vindiciæ Alphonsianæ, seu Doctoris Ecclesiæ S. Alphonsi M. de Ligorio Doctrina Moralis Vindicata, etc. (Rome: ex Typ. Polyglotta, S. C. de Propaganda Fide, 1873).* A work of the deepest interest to the students of moral theology. The discussion is conducted with singular charity, and, like all other such discussions, it loses nothing by being carried on in a learned language.—*The Patriarch and the Tsar.* Vols. II. and III. By W. Palmer, M.A. (Trübner, 1873). Two more volumes of Mr. Palmer's great work on the history of Nikon.—*Life of the Baron de Renty.* Edited by E. H. Thompson (Burns and Oates). A very instructively written biography, a longer notice of which—as most of the following volumes—we are sorry not to be able to insert.—*Suema, or the little African slave who was buried alive.* By Mgr. Gaume. Translated by Lady Herbert (Burns and Oates, 1873). Suema, a poor slave girl, underwent the most horrible cruelties, and was finally buried alive as useless, being worn out by the brutal treatment which she had received. She was happily rescued before life was extinct, and conveyed to the nuns at Zanzibar, where she received Christian instruction, and afterwards devoted herself to the good of her countrymen in the religious life.—*Leben des S. Petrus Faber, ersten Priester der Gesellschaft Jesu.* Von R. Cornely, S.J. (Friburg in Brissgau. Herder, 1873). An admirable biography.—*Hymns and Poems,* original and translated. By Edward Caswall, of the Oratory. Second Edition (Burns and Oates, and Pickering, 1873). And *A May Chaplet,* and other verses for the Month of Mary, translated and original. By K. D. Beste, of the Oratory (Washbourne, 1873). The Oratory seems the home of the Muse of sacred song. The translations by Father Beste are from the French of Father Philpin. We are glad to see Father Caswall's poems in a second edition.—*A Hundred Meditations on the Love of God.* By Father Southwell, of the Society of Jesus (Burns and Oates). The new volume of the Ascetical Library. These meditations by the famous Father Southwell have never before been printed.—*Devotions to the Sacred Heart.* By R. J. Carbery, S.J. (Dublin: Elwoode). A very beautiful little work, only too small and modest in size and aim.—*Conferences on the Spiritual Life.* By Father de Ravignan. Translated by Mrs. Abel Ram, with a Preface by Father Gordon, of the Oratory (Washbourne, 1873). Father Ravignan's Conferences to the "Enfants de Marie," in Paris, from notes taken by the ladies to whom they were addressed.—*Photographic Views.* By F. X. Weninger, S.J. (O'Shee, New York, 1873). A collection of reflections on a wide range of subjects, from "Nature in general" to the Path of Perfection and the Sacraments.—We close our list for the present with the acknowledgment of some indispensable books in their way, *Debrett's Peerage, Baronetage and Knighthood,* and *House of Commons and Judicial Bench,* all published by Dean and Son, Ludgate Hill; and *Herbert's London Illustrated,* a Complete Guide to the leading Hotels, Places of Amusement, &c.

r
g
e
i
t
g
.
e
y
g
e
y
l,
as
l.
ne
r-
is
aft
an
d.
es,
he
ry
of
of
nd
her
me
her
red
iful
aces
bel
sh-
de
ere
nee,
of
the
edg-
age,
nch,
ndon
use-